DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 400 95 CG 010 689

AUTHOR Samuels, Charelle; And Others
TITLE The Creation of Simulation Exercises to Train Group Leaders: A Monograph. Pupil Personnel Services: Training Professionals to Anticipate the Challenges of the Future.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. Dept. of Counselor Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 76
GRANT OEG-07-2021-(725)
NOTE 96p.; For related documents, see CG 010 685 - 692

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Group Dynamics; Group Relations; Group Structure; Helping Relationship; *Instructional Materials; *Interaction Process Analysis; Interpersonal Relationship; Leader Participation; *Leadership Training; *Personal Growth; *Simulation; Simulators

ABSTRACT

After a brief historical look at personal growth groups, this paper traces the steps involved in the development and evaluation of simulation materials which were designed to aid the group leader's understanding of his affect in the member/leader relationship. It examines the concept of this specific relationship in personal growth groups. Groups are discussed in terms of the following issues which typically surface in the member/leader relationship: dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality and separation. Particular consideration is given to the role of the leader and to the current status of training group leaders regarding these issues. Also included is a description of author-created simulation materials. A discussion of the field trial of these materials shows that simulations can be a valuable training tool for group leaders. Finally, suggestions for further study are made. (Author/KBP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED 126400

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CREATION OF SIMULATION EXERCISES TO TRAIN GROUP LEADERS

A MONOGRAPH

BY

Charelle Samuels, Ph. D.

Sean Hughes, Ph. D.

Patrick B. Malley, Ph. D.

Produced Under Grant

Continuation of Northeastern EPDA/FPS Center-Satellite Project

Award Number: OEG-070-2021 (725)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Evolution of Groups	3
	B. Common Factors in Groups	5
	C. Current Status of Groups	6
	Summary	8
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
	A. Member/Leader Relationship	9
	In General	9
	The Issues	11
	Summary	13
	B. Role of the Leader	14
	In General	14
	The Issues	14
	Summary	19
	C. Current Training	19
	Summary	24
III.	RATIONALE	25
	A. Need	25
	B. Statement of the Problem	25
	C. Uses	25
IV.	PROCEDURE	27
	A. The Filming	27
	B. The Try-Out Phase	28
	C. The Field Trial	28
V.	RESULTS	29
	A. The Try-Out	29
	B. The Field Trial	31
	Participants' Rating Scale	31
	Participants' Reaction Sheet	32
	Leader Reaction Sheet	35
	Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet	35
	Taped Interview With the Student Group	36
	Taped Interview With the Leader	37

Page

VI. DISCUSSION 40

A. The Creation of the Video Taped Simulations 40
B. The Try-Out Phase 41
C. The Field Trial 41
The Materials 42
The Participants 43
The Group Experience 44
The Evaluation Procedure 47
The Learning Proces 47

VII. SUGGESTIONS

A. The Taping Procedure 49
B. The Try-Out Phase 49
C. The Materials 50
D. The Evaluation Procedure 50
E. The Leader's Manual 51

APPENDICES

A. Participants' Rating Scale 52
B. Participants' Reaction Sheet 53
C. Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet 55
D. Try Out Reaction Sheet 56
E. Leader Reaction Sheet 58
F. Leader's Manual 60
G. Simulation Scripts 65
H. Character Sketches 71
I. Try-Out Tabulations 73
J. Participants' Rating Scale Tabulations 77
K. Participants' Reaction Sheet 78
L. Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet 79

BIBLIOGRAPHY 80

I. INTRODUCTION

At the University of Pittsburgh effort has been made to improve the quality of training for persons preparing to become group leaders. The need for innovation in the training of group leaders became apparent when a review of group theory was examined in light of current training practices.

The examination of group theory literature showed that many theorists consider the member/leader relationship to be the essence of personal growth groups. A review of current training practices showed that little, if anything, is done to train leaders specifically regarding their part in the member/leader relationship. While much group theory literature stresses the member's affective response to the member/leader relationship, little is written about the leader's affect.

It was this gap between group theory and current training practices which motivated the creation of materials designed specifically to aid in training group leaders regarding the affect generated in them as a consequence of being involved in the member/leader relationship in personal growth groups. The materials developed are in the form of video taped vignettes that simulate issues which emerge in the working out of the member/leader relationship; the materials include a leader's manual for use with the simulations.

This paper traces the steps involved in the development and the evaluation of these materials.

It begins with a brief historical look at personal growth groups in order to show the ways in which group therapy has changed from group psychoanalysis of the 20's. It demonstrates that while contemporary groups vary greatly in outward appearances, there are many factors common to most group methods used today. Description of current groups shows that personal growth groups are used for purposes different from older groups; they are used by participants different from former group participants; and they are led by trainers with backgrounds different from those of previous leaders.

In considering group theory, this paper examines the concept of the member/leader relationship in personal growth groups. It shows that many theorists believe the member/leader relationship to be the essence of groups. Groups are then discussed in terms of the issues which typically surface in the working out of the relationship. These issues are dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, and separation.

Particular consideration is given to the role of the leader and to the current status of training group leaders regarding these issues.

There follows a description of the materials created by the authors. A discussion of the field trial conducted to evaluate the materials shows that the simulations created can be a valuable training tool for group leaders.

Finally, suggestions for further study are made.

Throughout this study, the term "personal growth group" will be used to refer to a variety of contemporary group therapies which differ from the more traditional, more orthodox forms of psychoanalysis. The usual generic term for these kinds of groups is "encounter groups" (Schloss, Siroka and Siroka, 1971).

For this kind of group, Carl Rogers employs the term "intensive group experience" which he used to include T-group or lab groups, training laboratories, sensitivity training, basic encounter groups or workshops, and specialized groups such as Synonon groups (Roger, 1966).

For purposes of the authors, the phrase "personal growth group" will be used to include the following: encounter groups, sensitivity groups, training groups, theme-centered groups, laboratory and T-groups, marathon groups, and specialized groups such as Synonon groups.

A. Evolution of Groups

Personal growth groups made their way into public prominence between the mid 1960's and the early 1970's. Carl Rogers (1968) refers to the development of encounter groups as "perhaps the most significant social invention of this century."

Jane Howard (1970) suggests that the atmosphere for intensive interaction in small groups began as an outgrowth of the World War II environment of battalions, air-raid shelters, and foxholes. After World War II, there was a shortage of psychiatrists. It was a time when newer, shorter, and more liberal treatment methods were demanded. Focus shifted from insight to interaction (Mullan and Rosenbaum, 1962). It was this climate which led to the scientific study of small groups.

Central to the development of the encounter group movement was the establishment of the National Training Laboratory. Three men, Bradford, Benne, and Lippitt, who were influenced by such men as J. L. Moreno and Kurt Lewin, established the first training laboratory in 1946 as part of a summer program to train a group of community leaders who were participating in government-sponsored programs.

The aims of the first human relations leadership training conference were: (1) to study leadership styles and methods of group control for decision-making, (2) to study leadership from the point of view of group function not individual personality, and (3) to search for methods for members to use to discover, analyze, and cure their illnesses (Goldberg, 1971).

Lewin's influence evolved around his studies on the potential of small groups for changing behavior and attitudes. Lewin, Lippitt, and White studied leadership and were interested in the group climate. They also focused on group decision-making and the social forces involved in group processes (Lubin and Eddy, 1970). Lewin believed conflict was inherent in groups.

Treadwell (1972) cites Moreno's introduction, in 1931, of sociometry as a system for measuring interpersonal relations as a major breakthrough in group development. Moreno focused on the group membership needs of the individual and originated the use of psychodrama as a technique of therapy. He saw psychodrama as the essence of encounter and considered himself to have fathered the development of the encounter group movement. Kaplan and Sadock (1972) also see Moreno as the founder of encounter groups. Certainly he can be considered the innovator of role playing in this therapeutic context. According to Schloss, Siroka and Siroka (1971) almost all group trainers used psychodramatic techniques.

The second National Training Laboratory workshop, held in 1947, was called a Basic Skills Training Group (BST). It made use of an observer who fed back awarenesses of the group process to the group. Feedback

and process awareness were to become central to the encounter group movement. This kind of group became known as a T-group, the letter "T" stood for training (Schloss, Siroka and Siroka, 1971).

In these early years groups were viewed by National Training Laboratory from a sociological point of view primarily rather than a psychological point of view; the members' orientation was more academic than clinical (Goldberg, 1971; Schloss, Siroka and Siroka, 1971). In the 1950's, as clinical psychologists and psychiatrists became involved, the emphasis changed. The 50's, for the encounter group movement, was a time of conventional group procedures, according to Ruitenbeek (1970). In the late 1950's, there developed a split between those practitioners of National Training Laboratory who were oriented toward organizational needs and those focusing on personal growth skills (Schloss, Siroka and Siroka, 1971).

It was in 1954 when National Training Laboratory East met with UCLA that the Western Training Laboratory was founded and the term "sensitivity training" was coined.

Lakin (1972) describes the National Training Laboratory movement as contributing these concepts to group theory: emphasis on feelings, process observing, here-and-now focus, and structural ambiguity of leaders.

The National Training Laboratory movement was also influenced by Bion and the Tavistock school in England, which also focused on group process. The American counter-part of Tavistock in England became the Group Relations Center of the Washington School of Psychiatry (WSP) (Parloff, 1970).

Bion's theory of group development is based on the belief, similar to Lewin's, that a common group tension develops as the members' expectations of the leader are unfulfilled; he speaks in terms of a group culture and valences toward and away from the culture of the group. Bion added the concept of the unconscious to group theory when he described groups as functioning on an overt and covert or primitive level (Bion, 1961).

Of particular relevance to this study is Bion's belief that group members' identification with the leader was a result not simply of introjection, that is, the taking on of leader characteristics, but also projective identification, that is, the group members' attributing the leader with qualities which are actually being experienced by members but not owned.

Stock and Thelen (1958) characterized Bion's contribution as being (1) the use of an unstructured environment for the group and (2) the use of interpretation of the group emotion to the group.

The concept of a group culture was carried further by Ezriel. He conceived a common (shared) group tension which was a covert part of groups (Goldberg, 1971). In 1964, Whitaker and Lieberman speak of a common group tension consisting of three parts: (1) the forbidden motive (the wish), (2) the reactive motive (the fear), and (3) the resulting attempt to resolve the antagonism between the wish and the fear. Group activity is seen as always in flux.

The encounter group movement was also stimulated by the establishment by Michael Murphy and Richard Price of the Esalen Institute where such men as Bernard Gunther, William Schutz, and Fritz Perls experimented in a variety of new group techniques. The Institute represented a mixing of Eastern Mysticism and Western Pragmaticism. At Esalen, Perls popularized the use of Gestalt therapy with groups.

The term "encounter group" originated from a phrase coined by Rogers. He used the phrase "basic encounter group" to differentiate the new group treatments emphasizing the exploration of feelings in depth from the traditional, earlier T-groups (Ruitenbeek, 1970). Rogers' major contributions have been in the area of client-centered group therapy and in the concept of "unconditional positive regard." In 1959, he established the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute at La Jolla.

While these historical notes are not intended to be inclusive, they are to suggest the kinds of thinking which served as a background for today's personal growth groups.

From these early starting points and others, personal growth groups developed with increasing diversity. By the late 60's and early 70's, novelty became the fashion with the advent of techniques such as massage, meditation, yoga, nonverbal communication and others. Ruitenbeek (1970) sees the start of marathon groups in 1967 as the major breaking away from the traditional group methods which opened the way for further innovations.

B. Common Factors in Groups

Burton (1969) suggests that the diversity in contemporary growth groups is "more apparent than real." In reality, what appears to be a great variety of group practices is basically differences in emphasis. Rogers (1966) also sees the diversity as having less substance than it appears. Gibb (1972) describes the differences in groups as follows: sensitivity groups stress the social influences; the basic encounter groups stress reliable and valid giving of data; creativity-releasing groups focus on body, movement, sensory awareness, and dance; programmed groups utilize structured experiences or instruments; and Esalen groups, associated with the Association for Humanistic Psychology, deal experimentally with most of the above-mentioned techniques.

Kaplan and Sadock (1972) make the following distinctions: personal growth labs stress sensitivity training and member creativity; sensitivity training groups "seek self-awareness and understanding of group processes rather than relief from an emotional disturbance;" encounter groups are similar to sensitivity groups but they give greater emphasis to interpersonal relationships.

Although various kinds of groups differ in emphasis, most groups share a common set of values for which they stand. Rosenthal (1971) describes these as:

> . . . an open and unimpeded orientation to sensation and feeling: the search and affirmation of genuine personal identity; the effort to achieve interpersonal understanding through the acceptance of the feelings of one's self and others as well as through the dissolution of interpersonal ritual and hypocrisy; the elimination of intellectual defensiveness as a barrier to emotional insight and mutual understanding; the liberation of affirmative sexual impulse and other positive feelings; the achievement of a richer awareness of one's affective potentialities, inner experiences, and diversity of esthetic, sensory, and proprioceptive impulses; deep personal experiences of others; and the enrichment of compassion and warm, generous feeling toward particular individuals and to the world in general.

In terms of theory and practice, while groups may stress one concept more than another, most growth groups show the influence of the theorists mentioned above. They operate primarily or exclusively in the here-and-now, they create some degree of leader ambiguity (members are responsible for finding their own answers), they see conflict as central to group functioning, and they focus on the explorations of feelings. Rogers (1966) cites the common factors as: smallness, lack of structure, goals generated by participants, and focus on interaction. Lakin (1970) enumerates these: intimacy, sense of belongingness, authenticity and trust, and helpful feedback. Balgopal (1973) notes the similarity of most groups in that they focus on self-awareness and interpersonal interactions in here-and-now processes.

It appears then that the varieties of personal growth groups do possess common characteristics.

C. Current Status of Groups

According to Schutz (1973), between 1967 and 1972, at least two hundred growth centers using group methods developed. Maliver (1971) states that forty centers existed in the United States in 1967 and one hundred sixty-three (163) in 1971, according to the Association of Humanistic Psychology.

It is apparent, however, that personal growth groups have not only grown in number and variety in the last five years, but they have also changed in use. Much has been written to suggest that our society has changed in such a way that the older therapies can no longer meet the needs of today's patients; discussion of the social climate out of which generated the need for encounter groups appears in Parloff (1970, 1972); Rosenthal (1971); Schloss, Siroka and Siroka (1971); Ruitenbeek (1970); and Goldberg (1971).

Gordon and Liberman (1971) trace the changing function of groups. In the 1940's, group leaders were viewed as offering bargains--therapy at reduced rates as opposed to expensive individual therapy. During the 1950's, group activity became recognized as a separate entity. In the 60's, group use broadened to education, social work agencies, and mental health hospitals.

Personal growth groups are used for a variety of purposes today and in a variety of settings (Harren, 1969). They are currently being used in organizations (Benne, 1964 (B); Blank, 1971; Campbell and Dunnette, 1968; and House, 1970); in education (Fox and Lippitt, 1964), in communities, with families, as well as in the helping professions. Today National Training Laboratory, Western Training Laboratories, Boston University's Human Relations Center and UCLA's Institute of Industrial Relations all use groups for management training (Parloff, 1970).

Lakin (1972) describes training groups which are used for professional development in clinics, for nurses, judges, managers, and executives.

Participants enter personal growth groups today seeking different goals. They might be looking for fulfillment, awareness, joy, peace, self-realization, emotional instead of cognitive learning, or any number of other goals. Schofield (1964) suggests that today's clients have "philosophical neurosis," that is, clients are often seeking faith, meaning, and commitment. In effect, he says, they are not the kind of patients who bring to therapists the kinds of pathologies listed by the American Psychiatric Association.

The new personal growth groups are, as Burton (1969) describes them, "psychotherapy for those who are not diseased." He says, "encounter groups are now becoming so prevalent that they will soon constitute a secularized psychotherapy for Everyman." If Freud can be thought of as dealing with the sick segment of the population, the current group movement deals primarily with the healthy segment. Burton (1969) points out that Freud never considered being fully human as a goal; his goal was to help patients attain an existence above suffering.

The fault with traditional mental health, according to Burton, was that it lacked touch with the community.

Summary

While it is obvious that groups have increased in popularity and that they have proven to be valuable in a variety of institutional settings, the function they are serving is different from that served by traditional therapies of the past.

It is apparent that from the 1940's to today a major change in group therapy has occurred. There has developed a number of new group therapies different from earlier group psychotherapy in that they are not analytic and they do focus on a number of new dimensions such as feelings, and the here-and-now interactions.

Literature tends to show that the new personal growth groups possess characteristics generally common to all varieties of contemporary groups.

These new personal growth groups respond to changing conditions in society; they are used by participants seeking new ways of coping with problems typical of our age.

These changes in group therapy have brought into question the role and training of group leaders.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature pertaining to the member/leader relationship will be explored in this section. It will first be demonstrated that, for many theorists, the member/leader relationship is the group; it is the essence of the group. Some amplification of the nature of the member/leader relationship will be given.

The issues--dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, and separation--which typically develop out of the interaction between the members and the leader in this relationship will be examined. It will be demonstrated that these issues are commonly agreed upon issues which occur between the leader and the members. Some explanation of how these issues emerge is provided.

Next, the leader's role in the relationship will be examined. Leader affect in the group with specific reference to the issues of dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, and separation will be reviewed. It will be shown that leader response to his/her affect and the group's affect around these issues is crucial in the therapeutic process.

Finally, after examining groups as a relationship involving certain issues and after considering the leader affect related to these issues, the current status of leader training will be reviewed. In examining leader training the main focus will be on how well current training practices prepare leaders for the affect generated in them as the issues in the working out of the member/leader relationship emerge.

From consideration of the leader affect around these issues, the importance of leader response, and current training practices, a statement of the problem will be formulated.

A. Member/leader Relationship

In General

One of the earliest attempts to describe the member/leader relationship was made by Redl (1942) when he delineated two types of emotional relationships existing between the "central person" and members of a group.

Gibb (1964) says, "Whenever two or more persons interact in the pursuit of a common goal, the relationship of leadership and followership soon becomes evident."

A belief held by many group theorists--Grotjahn, (1972), Forer (1969), Redlich and Astrachen (1969), Stein (1963), Whitaker and Lieberman (1964), Gottschalk (1966), Mullan (1955), Slater (1966), Mills (1964), Lungren (1971), and Bennis and Shepard (1956)--is that the essence of a personal growth group is reflected in the working out of the relationship between the leader and the members.

Forer (1969) says stimulus for the problems of the relationship begins as the members want something from the therapist. They attribute to her/him "special powers" (Whitman, 1964). S/he is sometimes seen as omniscient and magical. Many theorists (Gottschalk, 1966; Bion, 1961; Slater, 1966) allude to the deification of the leader. One theory regarding this deification is that it stems from member anxiety over the ambiguous way in which discussions are held. Adoration could come from fear that an ordinary person might see the member's defenses (Semrad and Arsenian, 1951).

Another way of looking at the member/leader relationship is expressed by Slater (1966). He sees the group as being about the business of "incorporating" the leader--"orally, symbolically, and literally."

Transference occurs, according to Gottschalk (1966), as the leader will not assume the role expected of her/him. A struggle begins then as the ambiguous nature of the leader role and the general lack of structure frustrates the members. Issues involving authority soon surface. Gibbard, Hartman, and Mann (1974) see the leader as taking on the position of "externalized ego ideal of the group."

Mann with Hartman and Gibbard (1967) describes some of the goals in all groups. The group wants:

(1) to express the accumulated frustration of dependency needs;
(2) to mount a successful rebellion against the leader, in the interest of redistributing his power more equitably;
(3) to voice the member's growing fears of being manipulated;
(4) to take revenge upon the hero and to break the hero's tie with the leader;
(5) to 'do something' that might alleviate the distress and declining self-esteem of the members; and
(6) to either reduce the level of sexuality and aggression in the group or to add sensitivity to charisma as a way of becoming a valued and central person in the group.

Mann explains that most of the dynamics existing in the group generate from the leader's existence as an authority figure who does not meet the group's expectations.

It could be said that the leader's power is derived from that which is projected onto her/him by the members and by her/him refusal to accept that responsibility. Lakin (1972) theorizes that the member's position of dependency generates the tension and conflict which creates the potential for learning.

The Issues

When one examines the member/leader relationship closely, it becomes apparent that certain issues typically surface between leader and members. These issues are the dynamics of the working out of the relationship and are noted by all theorists who focus on the member/leader relationship in groups. For purposes of this study, these issues will be called "dependency," "competence/trust," "hostility," "separation," and "sexuality." Each of these will be considered in detail.

Dependency. The existence of member dependency on the group leader has been recognized by numerous theorists (Forer, 1969; Gibbard, Hartman and Mann, 1974; Bion, 1961; Benne, 1964 (A); Bach, 1954; Horwitz, 1964; Slater, 1966; and Harren, 1969).

Tuckman (1965) reviewing studies of training, laboratory, and therapy groups noted the existence of dependency of the leader in all groups.

Hartman and Gibbard (1974) describe this dependency as "symbiotic relatedness" suggesting, as Hinckley (1951) has, that groups expect the leader to take on a parental role.

R. D. Mann (1966) suggests that the members' dependency is a reaction to her/his initial anxiety and resistance to being in the group. Similarly, Slater (1966) attributes dependency to the fear of aloneness and responsibility. Members look to the leader to control their anxiety (Mann, 1966).

The attribution of "special powers" to the leader and the deification of her/him are part of the dependency issue in groups. This aspect has been noted by Whitman (1964), Gottschalk (1966), Bion (1961), Slater (1966) and Seldman, McBrearty and Seldman (1974).

Some theorists suggest that estimations of the leader are related to dependency needs in the members; for example, highly dependent members would tend to strongly deify the group leader (Seldman, McBrearty and Seldman, (1974).

Competence/Trust. Closely related to the issue of dependency is the issue of the members' question of the leader's competence, the members' trust of the leader. Gibbard, Hartman, and Mann (1974) note the ambivalent nature of the dependency and the ambivalent feelings members experience toward the authority figure.

Johnson (1963) believes that trust is the first issue in the formation of a working relationship.

Slater (1966) recognizes that members question the leader's competence. He attributes this mistrust to the member's feelings of dependency. Mann (1966) theorizes that the attack on the leader which occurs in groups has a competency question related to it.

Other theorists who recognize the issue of trust and competence in groups are Barnett (1973), Rogers (1970), Egan (1970), and Gibb (1964 and 1965).

Hostility. As early as 1949, Freud was recognizing the functions of overthrowing the apparent source of power in groups. He wrote of the "murder of the chief in primal hordes" as possibly present in therapeutic relationships.

It is inevitable, according to Slater (1966), that the dependency on the leader and the deification of her/him will lead to her/his becoming a "false god." This feeling of disillusionment causes the leader to become the object of group hostility and revolt. In fact, Redlich and Astrachen (1969) assert that much of what happens in a group emanates from the members' desire to take over the leadership.

In Mann's study (1966) of group feelings toward the leader, he described the hostility as stemming from the members' feelings when their affection and esteem for the leader are not returned. Similarly, Bennis (1964) describes a time of "counterdependency" in groups which comes about when the leader does not meet member needs. He notes the cathartic effect of the revolt.

From this revolt the group members take on some of the power of the leader (Hartman and Gibbard, 1974). When he describes member disillusionment with the leader, Bion (1961) alludes to this same phenomenon. Subsequently members pair into dyads where they hope for a new leader, a "messiah," to appear.

Theorists such as Slater (1966) generally see the value of the revolt coming from the members' recognition of their dependency. Mann (1966) suggests that the attack on the leader is more than a reaction to the frustration of the ambiguous structure of the group. He sees the revolt as a test, "an activist surge," as he calls it.

In essence, the members in revolt demonstrate both their growing independence and their identification with the leader (Slater, 1966); (Mills, 1964).

Sexuality. Slater (1966) asserts that if there is no attack on the leader in a group, there is little sexual energy among the members. While Slater suggests that one cannot differentiate between the aggressive and sexual feelings toward the leader, many theorists (Mills, 1964; Powdermaker, 1953; Semrad and Arsenian, 1951; Whitman, 1965; and Hartman and Gibbard, 1974) refer specifically to the sexual aspect of the member/leader relationship.

It is frequently asserted that members want the leader to her/himself (Whitaker and Lieberman, 1964; Mills, 1964; Semrad and Arsenian, 1951; Slater, 1966). Elaboration on the nature of members' sexual fantasies in groups has been done by Hartman and Gibbard (1973).

In 1974, they theorize that sexual feelings stem from the group's revolt against the leader and the group's taking on of the leader's power.

Slater (1966) concurs with Maslow (1963) in recognizing the eroticism connected with the transmission of knowledge. Slater also points out the sexual gratification associated with dependency.

Separation. Separation is widely acclaimed as an important issue in the member/leader relationship (Dunphy, 1964 and 1968; Mills, 1964; Coffey et al., 1950; Slater, 1966; Mann, 1966 and 1967; Schutz, 1958).

Mullan and Rosenbaum (1962) consider this issue as the most important one in the member/leader relationship. They note the finality of separation and the risk involved.

Slater (1966) also gives the issue of separation prominence. He conceptualizes the entire history of a group as dealing with separation. First the group must separate from the leader and then members must separate from the group.

Although separation is believed by many to be an integral part of the group process (Yalom, 1970, Mill, 1964; Mann, 1966 and 1967; Dunphy, 1968), it is one of the less understood issues in the member/leader relationship (McGee, Schuman, and Racusen, 1972).

In Mann's study (1966) in which he traced member feelings toward their leader throughout the course of the group's existence, he described the final period as one in which the members expressed a feeling of lack of closure. The members requested "absolution and love" from the leader in one final attempt to gain special recognition from her/him.

Summary

The data examined thus far suggests that the member/leader relationship is central to personal growth groups. There are identifiable issues which emerge in the working out of the relationship. These authors enumerate these issues as crucial: dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, and separation.

The leader's role in the working out of the relationship with particular emphasis on the above-mentioned issues will now be considered.

B. Role of the Leader

In General

Before considering leader affect regarding the specific issues in the member/leader relationship which were enumerated above, it is important to consider the leader role in the relationship in general. This consideration is important because it demonstrates that leaders participate in the therapeutic process just as members do.

Many theorists support the idea that leaders must deal with some of the same issues which confront members in groups (Slavson, 1953, Lakin, 1972; Beukenkamp and Berger, 1958; Mullan, 1955; and Gibb and Gibb, 1969). Stroh (1956) calls issues related to the role of leader as "master of ceremony functions" as opposed to those functions the leader serves as a member. He explains that members and leaders experience anxiety, identity confusion, and transference.

The concept of countertransference in groups has been discussed by many theorists (Mullan, 1955; Loeser and Bry, 1953). In fact, both Slavson in 1953 and Hadden in that same year expressed belief that countertransference is more important and more complicated in groups than in individual therapy because in a group the leader can be confronted by all the significant people from her/his past.

In effect, then, what goes on in a group is that the leader experiences similar affect and is asked to model for the members the kinds of behavior believed to be therapeutic (Lieberman and Whitaker, 1964).

The Issues

The issues dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, and separation, have special significance for the leader, then, just as they do for members.

Dependency. Much leader affect related to the member/leader relationship stems from the leader's attempt to live up to member expectations. Thomas (1960) points out that the leader's feelings are often related to those of the group. If the members expect a godlike leader, the leader tries to live up to that role. Mullan (1955) warns leaders against allowing themselves to feel omnipotent or allowing themselves to become vulnerable to other feelings emanating from the members' transferences.

If we assume that role behavior needs to be avoided by both members and leaders, the leader must be willing to give up her/his favored position (Egan, 1970; Stoller, 1969).

Mullan (1955) says that the therapist's status which comes from projected attitudes and transferences is the "most formidable obstruction to status denial within the group."

Beukenkamp and Bry (1958) focus on leader needs which are gratified by member dependence. He lists:

1. The need to cure which is related to the need to be omnipotent (Slavson (1953) calls this "aim detachment countertransference"),
2. The need to be in control,
3. The need to impress the group with skill and competence,
4. The need to feel knowledgeable.

Seldman, McBrearty and Seldman's study (1974) of deification of the group leader suggests that inexperienced and untrained leaders receive a great deal of gratification from member dependency and deification. The highly positive feedback seduces the leader into overestimating her/his own abilities.

Competence/Trust. Gibb and Gibb (1969) have focused their attention on the kinds of fears leaders have regarding their own competence as leaders. They list fear of losing control, fear of not knowing how to respond, and fear of doing the wrong thing. Lakin (1969) adds that leaders fear the group will discover the leader's hidden fear; such as, her/his fear that s/he is incompetent. Kotlov (1956) enumerates similar fears.

It is difficult to imagine a leader who does not fear that s/he may not know what to do if strong emotions erupted in her/his group (Lakin, 1972).

Jones et al. (1971) assert that no leader is immune to feelings of insecurity and incompetence. S/he may fear the demands placed on her/him; these demands may be heightened by the group's consensual power. Leader feelings of vulnerability and threat are also noted by Whitman (1964).

Leaders often derive their sense of competence from the success or failure of their groups. If a group is not productive, the leader blames her/himself. If s/he is facilitative s/he sees her/himself as a good leader (Lakin, 1972; Saretsky, 1972; Jones et al., 1971).

While it is apparent that the leader gains gratification from the growth of the members of the group and that s/he satisfies her/his own needs related to leadership (possibly status needs, according to Lippitt and This, 1967), much of the behavior on the part of the members and the leader in groups is based on role assumption. Gibb and Gibb (1969) point out that both members and leaders must move away from the dysfunction of roles. The leader, then, must function as a member and resist role behavior.

Mullan (1955) concurs; he stresses the importance of the leaders' getting out of his fixed role. In fact, he believes that patients are therapists and therapists are patients.

O'Day's study (1974) of National Training Laboratory group tapes sheds some light on leader reactions to issues involving leader competence. O'Day found that leaders tended to ignore or dismiss member complaints about leader ability. The leaders appeared to be more concerned with those activities which demonstrated that members had learned a lot. Leaders' self-disclosure was often used in an attempt to justify leader behavior rather than to benefit the members. And finally, O'Day found that leaders used member involvement as a measure of their competence.

Hostility. Several studies reveal leader reactions to hostility in their groups. Mann's study (1966) of the member/leader relationship in a group of students in a social relations class showed that leaders paid attention to feelings they (the leaders) tended to support. He found that leaders often did not hear hostile feelings directed at them and that they became defensive to suggestions of their hidden influence on the group.

Powdermaker and Frank (1953) made observations similar to Mann. He attributed leader "blind spots" to situations where both patients and doctors have the same neurotic reactions.

Tannenbaum, Wechsler and Massarik (1961) studied two well known trainers and their reactions to hostility toward them in their groups. The first trainer showed signs of fearing hostility and appeared to encourage it as a counter reaction. The other leader ingratiated himself in face of hostility. Both avoided emotional situations.

O'Day's study (1974) suggests similar response on the part of the leaders. He found that member/leader hostility was a difficult issue for leaders to handle. Leaders tried to change or negate members' negative perceptions of the leader. Leaders, it appeared to O'Day, united with members in trying to ignore hostility.

Slater (1966) points out that throwing off hostility is an automatic response. Leaders easily deflect the hostility from themselves onto other members or deal with it by being slightly punitive.

The leader response to the initial hostility expressed toward her/him is crucial (Mills, 1964) because that initial hostility is what unites the group (Semrad and Arsenian, 1951; Dunphy, 1968) and generates participant acceptance of responsibility in the therapeutic process (Lundgren, 1971).

Powdermaker and Frank (1953) attempt to explain why the leader's response to the hostility is so important. They say that the leader's

reaction is magnified because the patients look to her/him as a model. So the leader can heighten or decrease the effects of the hostility. The hostility, then, is only useful if the therapist feels secure enought to accept it and help the participants deal with it.

Some empirical data on the importance of the leader's response to the hostility exists. Mill's study (1964) using twelve groups at the Yale Interaction Laboratory, Lungren's study (1971), and Powdermaker and Frank's observations (1953) of group leaders, all confirm the importance of early interactions between members and leaders and the leader's role in the usefulness of these interactions. In Lungren's study, those leaders who reduced the early tensions were less facilitative.

Much is asked, then, of the leader. S/he must have a high level of tolerance for tension so that s/he does not promote premature closure in the name of personal comfort (Whitaker and Lieberman 1964). S/he must also show the group that s/he has a high level of tolerance for confrontation, that s he has the capacity to handle confrontation and to use it effectively (Mann, 1967). Sometimes, in fact, s/he must rechannel negative, hostile and projective feelings toward her/himself (Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik, 1961; Mills, 1964; Semrad and Arsenian, 1951).

One final source of difficulty in the leader's handling of the hostility in her/his group is that often the hostility is not expressed directly. So in addition to using the hostility effectively, the leader sometimes has the task of recognizing covert hostility as well (Powermaker and Frank, 1953).

Sexuality. Very little has been written about the leader's role in the issue of sexuality in a group.

Powdermaker and Frank (1953) point out that the leader's response to the sexual issue is often a problem because the issue of sex is often a problem for the leader her/himself. Often the leader does not discuss the issue because of her/his own anxieties related to sex.

Some mention of the effect of same sex or different sex between member and leader has been made. Mills (1964) says that differences in sex reduce the leader's ability to respond properly and inhibits the member's expression of hostility.

Powdermaker and Frank's observations (1953) showed that in male-led groups the leader was accepted as leader while in female-led groups there was a constant challenge of the leadership position.

Evidence of leader difficulty in resisting the seductive nature of leadership is demonstrated by Paul's (1973) suggestion of the need for

an ethical code for group facilitators. He points out that members often experience sexual feelings toward leaders as a result of leader status in the group. Paul sees the leader's succumbing to this seductiveness as "self-serving and self-deceptive."

Separation. Literature pertaining to the leader's role in separation suggests that sometimes leaders confuse their own needs with those of the patient and thereby prolong a member's participation or a group's life (Mullan and Rosenbaum, 1962).

It is clear that the leader's feelings enter into the separation process. It has been said that the quality of the separation is contingent upon the leader's actions and attitudes toward the issue. Current evidence suggests that frequently the issue of separation is avoided by therapists because of their own discomfort with it (McGee, Schuman and Racusen, 1972).

One source of discomfort in the separation process for the leader may be the denial behavior on the part of members which is usually associated with separation.

Often groups regress near the end and renewed hostility develops as a distancing device (Mann, 1966). It is also at this time that members usually acknowledge openly what the group has meant to them (McGee, Schuman and Racusen, 1972).

Yalom (1970) describes the significance of separation for the therapist as well as the members:

> The therapist, no less than the patients, will miss the group. For him, too, it has been a place of anguish, conflict, fear, and also of great beauty; some of life's truest and most poignant moments occur in the small and yet limitless microcosm of the therapy group.

While the focus above has been on the issues enumerated in the working out of the member/leader relationship, the data suggests that leaders are, in effect, like members of the group and, as such, they are faced with many of the same problems members face.

The leader, then, just as a good member, must be willing to allow her/himself to be known beyond her/his role. This requires that s/he be aware of her/his immediate experiences and that s/he will be willing to share her/his feelings (Thomas, 1969). In effect, the leader is a member and more than a member because s/he must serve as a model for the therapeutic process, a process experienced by both the members and the leader (Stoller, 1969; Yalom, 1970; Jourar, 1971; Mowrer, 1964; Rogers, 1970; and Dies, 1973).

Just as members enter groups in a role-defined manner hoping to have their needs fulfilled, so do leaders. Mullan (1953) views leaders as using the group to fulfill one of two needs: either the group serves to distract the leader from her/himself or the group is a vehicle before the leader that s/he can use for teaching, demonstrating, etc. Mullan believes these needs exist in all leaders.

Loeser and Bry (1953) describe the way in which the leader's entire personality can affect the group. He suggests that often the patients who fail do so because of the leader's countertransference, her/his identification with the patient's problems, or because of hostility which the leader hides under excessive permissiveness.

Much recognition has been given to the importance of leaders not using groups to fulfill their own needs (Lippitt and This, 1967; Gottschalk, 1966; Mullan, 1955; and Stoller, 1969). Montgomery (1973) not only points out the dangers of leaders who function out of their own needs alone, but he also questions how much self-knowledge one can reasonably expect of a leader in this regard.

On the other hand, evidence demonstrates clearly that leader response and behavior does make a difference in groups (White and Lippitt, 1953; Cartwright and Zander, 1953; Fiedler, 1953). Warkentin (1969) says the "leader's inner dynamics dominate the tone of the group throughout."

Summary

It becomes apparent that (1) the working out of the relationship between members and leader is crucial to facilitating growth in groups; that (2) leaders are influenced by this relationship as much as, and in much the same manner as, members, and that (3) leaders determine the extent and the kind of use which will be made of this working out of the relationship.

An examination of current thinking on the training of leaders will reveal the extent to which current training practices prepare leaders for this task.

C. Current Training

In order to determine the extent to which current training procedures prepare leaders to meet the needs outlined above, it is necessary to examine several aspects of training. First, the influence of change in personal growth groups and its effect on the leader's role will be considered in order to show that leaders need a different kind of training from that used for more traditional groups. It will also be used to show that there is a wide range of views existing today regarding the proper training of leaders.

While there is some disagreement about the kinds of experiences most beneficial for training leaders, it will be shown that many theorists advocate some didactic input regarding personality theory, psychopathology, and group process; experiential input from participation as a group member, from co-leading, from leading with supervision; and some self-study for personal growth.

The range of views regarding the value of group membership as training will be pointed out.

Finally, theorists' beliefs regarding the particular kinds of training necessary to prepare leaders for the working out of the member/leader relationship will be explored.

Changes in the role of groups in our society have brought into question the kind of training necessary for group leaders (Dies, 1974; Stoller, 1969; Yalom, 1970). Previous ways of leading groups--Burton (1969) describes these as coming from a "medical model",--are not always applicable to contemporary groups. The breaking down of the "medical model" that is, training in psychoanalysis or psychiatry alone, is apparent when one considers the variety of fields from which leaders emerge today. Today's leaders come from not only a variety of academic areas such as social work and education but also many are laymen or clergymen. Frequent reference to self-appointed leaders is made (Parloff, 1972; Bach, 1968).

Lakin (1969) asserts that leaders are not as well trained today as were, earlier, traditional group leaders. Schwartz, Siroka and Siroka (1971) also acknowledge a lack of proper training of leaders. In fact, it is often assumed that no training of leaders is necessary or that participation in a group led by a noted leader is sufficient training.

Today, it is possible and sometimes acceptable for the leader not to be the most knowledgeable member of the group. In these cases, as Anthony (1972) and Grotjahn (1972) point out, the value in leadership might be that the leader be the most open and honest member rather than the most knowing. Another assumption questioned by Mullan and Rosenbaum (1962), for example, is that leaders only need to be able to do individual therapy in order to be effective group leaders.

While some practitioners appear to have a casual attitude toward training leaders, others point to lack of proper training as hazardous and related to the casualities which occur in groups. Maliver (1971) views leader competence as a central issue in assessing the hazards in groups. A study of encounter group casualities conducted by Yalom and Lieberman (1971) demonstrated that various leadership styles resulted in a greater probability of casualities in groups. The significane

of proper training of leaders for avoiding casualties is also asserted by others (Bach, 1968; Parloff, 1970).

The advocates of training vary in their positions on cognitive versus experiential training. Theorists such as Johnson (1972), Schein and Bennis (1965), Whitman (1964), and Jacobs, et al. (1973) who list almost step by step procedures in such areas as confrontation and who describe how and when to perform certain behaviors--can be seen as advocating cognitive learning as a way of increasing an individual's ability to lead groups.

Massarik (1972) might be considered a spokesman for those who stress the experiential. He suggests that the transition from the theoretical to the applied is a very complicated one and knowledge for effective leadership comes from an extremely wide variety of academic areas; such as psychology, philosophy, anthropology, or from non-academic areas; such as, massage, yoga, and exercise. He concludes that the effectiveness of the trainer rests, in the final analysis, on her/his humanness but that some conceptual knowledge, training experience as a group member, supervised training and technique training are also needed.

The growth away from didactic training is apparent in the move by the Annual Institutes sponsored by the American Group Psychotherapy Association. They are proceeding almost entirely in experiential group processes today (Parloff, 1972).

Of those advocates of a combination of cognitive and experiential learning, Lakin's (1972) description of the necessary training for a group leader is typical. He recommends that a leader have experience as a member in two groups, observer in five groups, a co-leader in five groups, a leader in five groups, a participant in self-study, and a supervisee.

He also points out that membership in groups is not sufficient training; emotional maturity is necessary.

Theorists such as Rogers (1966 and 1970), Grotjahn (1972), Burton (1969), and Mann (1966) all point out the need for personal growth on the part of leaders.

Some theorists who recommend experiences as a group member for trainees have the therapeutic effects in mind. Stein (1963) advocates membership in a group for trainees to lessen inhibitions and resistances and to increase one's self-awareness.

Stein (1963) surveyed fifty-four (54) American Group Psychotherapy Association members who were authorities in group psychotherapy and who

were active in training leaders regarding their views of proper training procedures. Of the thirty (30) replies he received, all believed in the importance of understanding dynamics and psychopathology, and the need to observe and participate in workshops. Most felt personal analysis was not necessary but was desirable. While there was disagreement about the value of experiences as a group member, those who favored it thought trainers would have an opportunity to work out tension difficulties in such areas as authority and peer relationships and to have an opportunity to experience what patients felt.

Semrad and Arsenian (1951) represent theorists who advocate participation in groups as a training experience for leaders. While Ruitenbeek (1970) agrees that participation is important, he believes that it is not enough. Wile (1973) has a similar point of view. As a group member, a trainee can gain confidence in the group process and added belief in the strength of group members; but, Wile points out, learning to be a good member is different from learning to lead groups. As a member one is uncritical of her/his own attitudes and sensitivities to others.

Awareness of transference and countertransference is also important, as well as general analytic and diagnostic knowledge. Cohn (1961) points out that while recognition of countertransference problems has increased, adequate training specifically relevant to this issue has not existed. She believes most ineffective responses on the part of well-trained leaders can be traced to countertransference problems. Gottschalk (1966) appears to concur, stating that participation in a group does not teach a leader enough so that s/he will not act in ways harmful to the participants.

Most programs developed for training in a particular group method such as National Training Laboratory, psychodrama, gestalt, and theme-centered groups, depend heavily upon leader training through participation in personal growth groups as part of their training.

Some respondents to Stein's questionnaire (1963) regarding training procedures suggested that membership in a group had limited value for trainees because trainees are not really free to deal with their feelings in that environment. They questioned therapy in a training context. Lakin, Lieberman, and Whitaker (1969) have a similar point of view. They point out that while trainees may experience the member role and the group's social system, they are not patients, they are not as troubled. They also suggest that it is possible that trainees might become too involved in the group and, therefore, would not be able to distance themselves enough to learn about groups this way.

Lakin, Lieberman, and Whitaker seem to summarize the areas designated by most theorists as necessary for training group leaders. They suggest

that leaders need to know themselves--their own needs, their fears of the group, their style of therapy--and they need to know some theoretical elements--how group therapy differs from individual therapy, how one is facilitative, how change occurs.

It seems apparent then that there is a specific training that is necessary for preparation as a group leader and that it differs from that which is necessary for preparation for individual therapy (Mullen and Rosenbaum, 1962).

There has been very little reference made to how a leader is trained to deal with the working out of the member/leader relationship in groups. Some allusion is made to the kinds of skills needed, however. Some state that the therapist must know her/himself well enough that s/he can control and use her/his countertransference (Grotjahn, 1972; Ruitenbeek, 1970). Lakin, Lieberman, and Whitaker (1969) point out that in addition to being aware of her/his own feelings, the leader needs to know about the power of consensus in groups.

In attempting to help leaders cope with their own affect, Jones et al. (1971) suggest leaders need to have greater knowledge of this issue, need to be more aware of their own vulnerabilities, and need to know techniques to deal with these problems.

Bach (1968) describes the effects of poor training on leaders of marathon groups. He notes that these leaders often resort to gimmicks and games.

Blank (1971), noting the problem of leader needs and their interference with group needs, points to training as the answer.

> . . . Relevant training geared toward filling specific objectives is at least a minimal guarantee that the leader is not working out merely his own needs of his loneliness or satisfying his voyeurism, exhibitionism, or desire for power--that he at least recognizes these needs and is channeling them constructively in the service of the individuals who make up the group.

Important work on specific training for group leaders has been done by Ruth Cohn (1961 and 1965). She addressed herself to the question of the emotional skill of the leader and how it can be developed in groups. According to Cohn (1965), it is necessary to teach leaders to use their "subjectivity objectivity." In order to do this, there must be "reduction of neurotic fixations . . . and an increase in intuitive skills."

Cohn points out that although training leaders in emotional skills has generally been done in personal analysis, the training has been inadequate because group leadership is a unique situation and, therefore, requires unique training.

Summary

In sum, the leader must know her/himself in the context of the personal growth group; s/he must be aware of her/himself as a leader.

Exploration of current views of training shows that the nature of training is in a state of flux as a consequence of the new role of groups in our society. Many general kinds of experiences are enumerated as being necessary for trainees; for example, didactic training, experiential training and self-study are all recommended.

When one examines literature on the member/leader relationship, on the other hand, theorists stress that the relationship is primary and suggest that the leader's role is crucial. Although theorists point out extensively the kind of damage leaders can do in dealing with this issue and the ways leaders can be effective in dealing with the member/leader relationship, almost nothing appears in the literature regarding training specifically focusing the trainee's attention on the issues related to the working out of the member/leader relationship.

III. RATIONALE

A. Need

The literature examined thus far suggests that personal growth groups have not only increased in popularity and in use in recent years, but are also different from traditional group psychotherapies. Among other similarities existing among the varieties of these groups, both the theoretical and empirical data place a great deal of importance on the member/leader relationship as the essence of the therapeutic process in personal growth groups. Theorists emphasize the affective dimension of this process and expound the importance of the leader's response to the issues generated as the relationship is worked out.

The role of the leader in personal growth groups has changed as the function of the groups has changed. Today many believe that training specific to group leadership is necessary; these authors add that training specific to the member/leader relationship is one kind of specific group leadership training which is needed.

B. Statement of the Problem

The purpose, then, of this study was to create simulation materials focusing on the issues (dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, and separation) which emerge in the working out of the member/leade relationship. These materials center the student leaders' attention on the affect generated in them and on the consequences of possible leader behavior.

C. Use

It seems important then that the leader comes to know himself in the group context. It is with this need in mind for group leaders that the authors specified the following objectives for the materials to be developed.

(a) They should help the student of group leadership recognize the issues in the working out of the member/leader relationship when they occur in a group.
(b) They should help the student of group leadership become more aware of his/her affect resulting from these issues.
(c) They should help the student of group leadership become more aware of his/her typical behavior resulting from these issues.

(d) They should help the student of group leadership consider some of the implications of his/her possible behavior.
(e) They should help the student of group leadership consider some alternative behaviors.

The materials developed to meet these objectives were intended for students--counselors, therapists--wanting to increase their effectiveness as group leaders. Although students could vary in experience from never having led a group to having had several experiences leading groups, the authors assumed that the materials would not be used by experts.

While it was the intention of the authors to focus the student's attention on the existence of and his reaction to the issues designated, it is acknowledged that the materials would not model the dynamics of a group, but they would merely isolate issues. The subtleties of group process were not overtly depicted; and while the issues simulated usually appear in a more covert manner, for instructional purposes, the issues were isolated. For example, the issue of timing involved in the handling of these issues was not depicted in the representation of a group.

The authors further acknowledged that in reality distinguishing between several of the issues, such as hostility and sexuality, is extremely difficult, if not impossible. It was expected only that students would recognize the main thrust of each simulation as the author intended, even though other dynamics were also represented.

The materials were created in the form of simulations on video tape along with a leader's manual to standardize their use and the subsequent class discussion (Appendix F).

The viewing of the materials and discussion was intended for groups of eight to fifteen students. The materials were not designed for large groups. It was intended that the group be led by a teacher who would be equipped with a manual.

The viewing and discussion period for one simulation required approximately two hours. It was not assumed that students would necessarily observe each simulation during the duration of a course. No specific sequencing of the materials was intended.

IV. PROCEDURE

A. The Filming

The authors developed the simulations by first establishing the need and goals described above. Next, a script was created for each issue to be simulated. (Appendix G). The purpose of the script was to clarify the authors' conception of how the issue might be manifested in a group.

At the same time, the authors created a hypothetical group by identifying various personality types prevalent in groups. These types were selected on the basis of types experienced by the authors in groups. While the types were not intended to be all inclusive, they did represent these individuals' experiences with major personality types in groups.

Brief character descriptions for each type were written (see Appendix H). In creating the scripts, an effort was made to imagine how each personality type would feel about and react to the issue being simulated.

Persons portraying the hypothetical members of the group were selected from students in the masters and doctoral degree programs in counselor education at the University of Pittsburgh. The authors selected each person on the basis of their belief that s/he fit one of the personality types described above.

At the time of the filming, the authors involved the members of the hypothetical group in a discussion of various character types in groups. The members were asked to identify with a particular type that they could portray in the simulations. Discussion continued centering on the thoughts, feelings, and behavior of each type.

The members were then told of an event or they originated events which would occur in the hypothetical group and they were told of the issue to be simulated. (Some events were very loosely based on the scripts, others were not.) Some discussion of how each character type might feel and react to an event and the issue followed. A closing for the simulation was planned.

An improvisation based on the event described was then filmed. During that improvisation the members tried to behave as if there were an actual leader in the group; members would direct statements to the leader and they would speak about the leader. In reality there was no designated leader present. For some simulations, the leader was referred to as a female; for others, a male.

This procedure was followed for each simulation. The improvisations were filmed on Sony three quarter (3/4) inch color video tape. Later a print was made on Sony one-half (1/2) inch black and white video tape.

The number of simulations made on each issue depended on the actors' ability to identify with the issue.

The filming session yielded eight simulations: one on dependency, three on competence/trust, one on hostility, two on sexuality, and one on separation.

B. The Try-Out Phase

The trying out of the materials was conducted by having three doctoral students in Counselor Education at the University of Pittsburgh view all the simulations and provide feedback on the materials. The Try-Out Reaction Sheet appears in Appendix D. A simulation was judged acceptable if two of the three judges ranked the simulation above or in the middle of three descriptive rating scales provided in the Try-Out Reaction Sheet.

C. The Field Trial

Fourteen students just having completed Masters degrees in counselor education at the University of Pittsburgh participated in the field trial. They attended eight two-hour sessions at each of which a simulation was shown and discussion was conducted according to the manual provided. The leader of the student group was a doctoral student in the Counselor Education program at the University of Pittsburgh.

Each simulation was evaluated on the basis of three forms: A Participants' Rating Scale (Appendix A), a Participants' Reaction Sheet (Appendix B), and a Leader's Reaction Sheet (Appendix E). The overall effectiveness of the materials was evaluated by summarizing the data from these forms and from a Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet (Appendix C).

Student evaluation remained anonymous by having the students identify themselves by number.

The basis for the evaluation forms was derived from those used by S. L. Gross (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973) and J. M. Fitch (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1975).

V. RESULTS

A. The Try-Out Phase

The results of the try-out phase of this study show the difficulty in isolating the issues in the member/leader relationship. They also show that the simulations were rated rather consistently high as to interest and realism. Tabulations showing the Try-out results appear in Appendix I.

The Try-out Reaction Sheet was designed to obtain feedback on the content of the video tape in order to determine whether the judges saw the issues simulated as they actually intended.

There were two acceptance criteria: (1) the ranking first by two of the three judges of the issues intended to be simulated and (2) the ranking of the interest, realism and technical quality above or at the middle rating.

Three students in the doctoral program in counselor education at the University of Pittsburgh were selected by the authors to act as judges in the study. Each had extensive experience leading groups.

Two of the judges were white women, one spoke English as a second language. The other judge was a Black male.

Although they observed the video tapes together, they rated them separately.

The results of their judging follows.

It should be noted that for purposes of simplicity, the simulations discussed throughout the remainder of this paper will be referred to as follows:

video tape footage 050 will be called Dependency
video tape footage 161 will be called Competence/ Trust I
video tape footage 221 and 243 will be called Hostility
video tape footage 280 will be called Competence/ Trust II
video tape footage 410 will be called Sexuality I
video tape footage 485 will be called Sexuality II
video tape footage 546 will be called Competence/ Trust III
and
video tape footage 584 will be called Separation.

The dependency simulation was considered by two of the three judges to be demonstrating dependency as intended by the author. The third judge considered dependency to be the second most obvious issue simulated. On this basis, the simulation was considered acceptable for use in the field trial.

Competence/Trust I was accepted for use since two judges saw the intended issue, competence/trust, as the primary issue and judges considered competence/trust and another issue as the main issue simulated.

All judges saw Hostility as depicting hostility, as intended. It was, therefore, accepted for use.

The second half of Hostility was evaluated separately so that it could be used independently if desired. It was also accepted as a simulation of hostility since two judges saw the issue depicted as hostility; it was also noted that a variety of other issues was seen in this simulation.

Competence/Trust II was accepted because two judges saw competence/trust as the main issue; again, a variety of other issues was noted by the judges.

Two judges saw sexuality as the main issue in Sexuality I. This simulation was accepted for use in the field trial.

Sexuality II became an exception to the acceptance policy. One judge saw sexuality as the major issue; two judges ranked it second. One of the two who ranked it second ranked hostility first. Since literature previously mentioned (page) suggests the difficulty of distinguishing between sexuality and hostility in groups, the authors allowed this simulation to become an exception to the acceptance policy.

Competence/Trust III was changed from hostility to competence/trust since two judges saw competence/trust as the main issue and one judge ranked it second in importance.

All judges saw Separation as intended; it simulated separation and, therefore, was accepted for use in the field trial.

On the basis of the ratings of interest, realism, and technical quality, all simulations were considered acceptable for use in the field trial.

The results of the interest and realism were all (except for one judge's rating of the second half of Hostility and one judge's rating of Separation) ranked in the highest or second highest rating.

The third category, technical quality, yielded a greater variety of responses. Often the ratings were in extreme opposition--very high or very low.

One of the judges later explained that her difficulty with the technical quality of the simulations came from her difficulty with hearing the language well, since English is her second language. Competence/Trust II would have been considered unacceptable on the basis of its low technical rating, but it was considered an exception for this reason. It had received two "fair" technical ratings and one "well done" rating.

On the basis of recognition of the issue simulated and ratings of interest, realism, and technical quality, eight simulations were available for use in the field trial.

B. The Field Trial

The field trial was conducted for four consecutive days from 10:00 to 12:00 and from 1:00 to 3:00 beginning on June 23rd, 1975. The group consisted of fourteen volunteers who had just received Masters degrees in Counselor Education at the University of Pittsburgh in the Day or Evening programs. There were thirteen females and one male, and the group was led by a Black doctoral student in Counselor Education from the University of Pittsburgh. There were two black females in the group.

Attendance in the group ranged as low as eleven on occasion but remained mostly at thirteen or fourteen.

It should be noted that the group was highly resistant to completing the written questionnaires provided for evaluation of the materials. They found the questionnaires redundant and stifling.

The results of the field trial will be related through an examination of the Participants' Rating Scale, the Participants' Reaction Sheet, the Leader Reaction Sheet, the Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet, a report on a taped interview with the participants, and a report on a taped interview with the leader.

Participants' Rating Scale

Tabulations of the Participants' Rating Scale for each simulation used in the field trial appear in Appendix J.

These figures show that the participants tended to rate all elements in the scale--usefulness, interest, realism, and clarity--similarly.

Competence/Trust I and Competence/Trust III received the lowest ratings and the greatest spread on ratings; Sexuality I and Separation were rated highest and received a high amount of unanimity.

With the exception of Competence/Trust I, the majority of the participants ranked each simulation in the highest or second highest rating for each category on the scale.

Participants' Reaction Sheet

The results of the Participants' Reaction Sheet will be considered in two parts: first the "yes" and "no" answers and second, the comments to the questions. Tabulations of the "yes" and "no" answers appear in Appendix K.

On many occasions, it was difficult to determine whether the participants were responding "yes" or "no" to the questions on the Participants' Reaction Sheet. Frequently only a comment was made. Since space was provided on the questionnaire under the "yes" and "no" responses, the authors assumed that a comment in the "yes" space meant a "yes" answer and vice versa. This inference may not always have been valid since remarks in the "yes" space, for example, sometimes appeared to be saying "no" to the question. Nevertheless, the authors made the inference that unless a "yes" or "no" response was designated specifically, the location of the answer indicated the response.

The vast majority of the responses to the questions on the Participants' Reaction Sheet were "yes." For that reason, the authors considered responses with a high proportion of "no" answers to be noteworthy. On four occasions more than three participants responded "no" to a question.

In responding to the affect generated by Competence/Trust I, seven participants saw the simulation as facilitative; six saw it as impeding awareness of affect related to that issue. It is interesting to note that all participants saw the class discussion accompanying that simulation as facilitative in increasing awareness of affect.

In response to Sexuality I, ten participants saw the simulation as facilitative in increasing awareness of affect; four saw the simulation as impeding. In that situation, the responses to the class discussion in terms of facilitating or impeding awareness of affect were not as striking: ten yes's, two no's.

The response to Separation showed that eight participants saw the simulation as facilitative in their learning about their typical behavior in that situation; four saw the simulation as impeding that process.

The final area of wide disagreement was also in the separation simulation; there seven participants found that the class discussion facilitated awareness of alternative behaviors; five saw the discussion as impeding.

Aside from the responses noted above, no significant differences were noted between the responses to the simulation or the class discussion in any of the areas questioned.

A consideration of each simulation and the subsequent class discussion may show areas of particular effectiveness or ineffectiveness.

The dependency simulation appeared to be most effective in focusing on the issue both by use of the simulation itself and the class discussion it generated. The simulation appeared weakest in facilitating awareness of typical behavior, and the class discussion was weakest in increasing awareness of the implications of behavior.

Competence/Trust I appeared to be most effective in promoting class discussion regarding affect generated by the issue. The simulation seemed to be especially ineffective in the same area.

Hostility evoked fairly consistent responses to all questions and, therefore, showed no high or low areas.

The weakest areas for Competence/Trust II were the simulation's ability to focus on the issue and the class discussion's ability to promote awareness of affect regarding the issue.

Although responses to Sexuality I show that this simulation was weakest in increasing awareness of affect regarding the issue, there were reports of highly emotional sharing of experiences with the issues. This simulation appeared to be most effective in increasing focus on the issue and the class discussion was effective in promoting awareness of typical behavior.

Responses to questions regarding Sexuality II and Competence/Trust III showed consistent "yes" responses to all questions with few exceptions.

The separation simulation seemed least effective in evoking awareness of typical behavior, and the class discussion appeared to do little to increase awareness of alternative behaviors. The simulation was particularly effective in focusing on the issue. The class discussion was most effective in focusing on the issue, in increasing awareness of affect and in increasing awareness of typical behavior.

In order to report the comments on the questions which appeared in the Participants' Reaction Sheet, the responses have been placed into three categories: those responses which allude to how or what the participants learned, those responses which refer to problems which occurred during the field trial and those responses which would be useful suggestions for future use. The latter will be presented in the "Discussion" section of this paper.

According to the participants, the simulations served as "energizers" in the experience. The affect generated from watching the simulations caused the student to feel pressured. Students felt a need to respond to the video taped group or to learn how to respond for future use. The effectiveness of these materials seemed to be, then, in initially producing this motivation.

The simulations were described by one participant as the "kickoff" with the class discussion being the substance. Many suggested that the discussion clarified the affect.

Often the discussion would bring out past experiences which the students recalled after seeing the simulation. In the class discussion the simulation was used as a common referrent which served to define the discussion in precise terms. The peer group of student leaders was then used to check out typical behavior and alternative behaviors.

Frequently, members noted the parallel process existing between their group and the group on the video tape. They noted that they often learned about their typical behavior, for example, by observing how they behaved in the parallel process.

As the group progressed, it moved to less and less reliance on the leader for structurin

The following are descriptions of specific kinds of learning reported by some members during the field trial.

1. They learned some ways in which their own affect would get in the way of what was best for the group they might be leading.
2. They learned about how they, as leaders, might over-identify with members of their group.
3. They began to identify themselves as group leaders rather than as members.
4. They learned some leadership styles as shown by the alternative behaviors suggested by class members.
5. They began to identify several issues occurring in the video taped group.
6. They learned of some unresolved issues which they needed to deal with in order to become more effective leaders.
7. They learned that they need to develop ways to deal with feelings they, as leaders, have which they consider to be un-acceptable feelings.
8. They learned that as leaders they will have conscious and unconscious feelings, such as attractions, for members of their groups.

Problems occurring during the field trial were also reported by the members.

Many members noted difficulty identifying as a leader while watching the video tape. This problem was reported to decrease with time and to be less relevant for students who had led several groups prior to the field trial experience.

Students were sometimes frustrated by the limitation of being able only to fantasize about the implications of their behavior and about alternative behaviors. They would like to have had a chance to try out possible behaviors. There was some mention of difficulty in hearing (letting in) the alternatives suggested.

A rather esoteric difficulty is that students reported that knowing some individuals in the video tape distracted them at first.

Several comments were made about the non-existent leader of the video taped group. Students were confused by the change in leader name and sex. One student had difficulty identifying with a leader of the opposite sex. Defining the behavior of the leader too precisely caused students to lose their identification with the leader role. This was reported to be especially true in the video tape on the leader who was late. (Competence/Trust III)

The issue of how a leader deals with her/his strong negative feelings toward members was a pressing one which was not resolved for many members.

Students reported having little or no affective response to Competence/Trust I.

The term "Competence/Trust" was confusing for the students.

Leader Reaction Sheets

There was resistance on the part of the leader in filling out the Leader Reaction Sheets. The resulting forms did not provide any significant information. (Information from the leader will be provided in a report on a taped interview with the leader.)

Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet

The tabulations of the Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet appear in Appendix L. The results show that both the simulations and the class discussion rated very high in helpfulness in all areas--increased recognition of the issue, awareness of affect, awareness of typical behavior, implications of behavior and awareness of alternative behaviors.

The class discussion ranked slightly higher than the simulations in all areas.

The simulations were shown being especially effective in aiding students in recognizing the issues. They were least effective in increasing awareness of alternative behaviors.

Taped Interview with the Student Group

Because of the strong negative affect expressed by the members of the class regarding the questionnaires, the authors decided to interview the members as an added source of reaction to the field trial. (There was no resistance to this form of data gathering.)

Although many of the comments made on the tape were repetitious of comments made on the Participants' Reaction Sheet, all relevant remarks have been included in order to demonstrate those responses stressed by the participants.

Again, responses have been classified as those referring to learning, those referring to problems and suggestions. The suggestions will appear in the "Discussion" section of this paper.

Regarding the learning during the field trial, the students made these comments:

1. The simulations helped them learn about their affect as leaders.
2. They learned some of the implications of being a leader in terms of some of the issues with which they would be confronted.
3. They experienced being called leader.
4. They became aware of unresolved issues within themselves.
5. They learned that they might behave as leaders in a way which would not be facilitative to the group.
6. They learned to recognize issues occurring within a video taped group and they defined these issues.
7. They learned to recognize what was occuring in the class group by watching the video taped group.

Again students commented that the simulations helped them get in touch with their affect and the class discussion clarified what they experienced.

The students felt that the timing of the workshops--twice a day for four days--added to the effectiveness of the experience by heightening its intensity.

Participants in the field trial recognized these problems:

1. They did not learn enough about the consequence of their behavior and about alternative behaviors.

2. They sometimes had difficulty being leaders. This improved with time.

3. The change in leader name and sex on the video tape was confusing.

4. They had difficulty identifying with the leader role when they identified too strongly with the member affect being expressed. This occurred in the separation simulation.

5. Too specific a description of leader behavior (as occurs in Competence/Trust III) makes identification with the leader role difficult for the students.

6. It is necessary to be in touch with one's potential to be the way the group describes the leader in order to have an affective response to the simulation.

7. The students needed to know the kind of group they were watching and the group's length.

Taped Interview with the Leader

The assessment of the field trial made by the leader has been divided into two areas: specific comment regarding each simulation and general comments on the entire experience.

The comments from the tape selected for reporting were those which referred to how or what the participants were learning (this sometimes took the form of what was going on or discussed in the group), the problems which occurred, and suggestions made.

The leader described the first simulation, dependency, as yielding a high affective response during the observation of the video tape. The discussion of their affect afterward was difficult; and the leader felt the need to help participants articulate what they experienced. The students learned about the issue by seeing it and recognizing what was occurring.

The leader noted that it was easy for the students to focus on the process rather than the content of the first simulation. On the other hand, it seemed difficult for participants to discuss alternative behaviors.

During this first session the group asked for guidelines in terms of the field trial group in much the same way the video taped group asked for guidelines. The students did not notice the similarity.

The viewing Competence/Trust I did not evoke a strong affective response according to the leader. Affect was generated later by a discussion of similar events outside the group and by the leader's challenging the members to get in touch with their affect regarding the video tape.

Again students had difficulty dealing with typical behavior, implications of behavior, and alternative behaviors.

The class discussion moved to trust within the group itself. Students noticed the similarity between their concerns and those expressed by the members of the video taped group.

The leader characterized the third session, which used both parts of Hostility, as full of confusion and energy. He felt a loss of central position in the group. He described cross conversations which excluded him. Students followed the structure of the discussion without guidance from the leader.

The members seemed more free to share their affect and typical behavior. (The leader attributes this change possibly to his challenge of the group the day before or to the simulation itself.)

Much class discussion centered around what to do with negative affect toward a member when one is leading a group. The leader experienced ambivalence about sharing his negative affect regarding a member of the group.

In the afternoon session, when Competence/Trust II was shown, the leader noted the students' developing increased feelings for members of the video taped group. It was as if they were getting to know and to like and dislike members of that group. The student group became divided about what was occurring in the video taped group; they were split in their siding with members of the video taped group.

The leader resolved his ambivalence about a member who was annoying him and he confronted her.

The group became split on his behavior. The issue centered around what leaders should do with negative feelings toward group members.

Sexuality I evoked a great deal of affect. As the discussion proceeded, the members revealed a great deal about themselves as stress seemed to be on how they felt about the issue. The leader could not account for the high affect and the high level of sharing which occurred. He noted the timelessness: that is, the current popularity, of the topic as a possibility.

According to the leader, students seemed to learn about incongruities between their feelings and behavior regarding this issue.

The group became protective around the video tape member who had revealed himself in that simulation and his antagonist became the student group's antagonist.

The leader observed the student group still struggling with lack of resolution regarding the issue of negative feelings toward members of the group one is leading.

The leader described the student group in the next session when Sexuality II was shown as orderly. They appeared to have a clear set of rules to follow as a group.

The response to the video tape was a pressure to reach a consensus regarding the appropriate behavior in this situation. The leader was strongly aware of the press in the group to reach agreement.

When Competence/Trust III was shown, the leader noted the participants' difficulty in identifying with the leader described on the video tape. He asked members to get in touch with similar attacks they had experienced as non-leaders; and while the students were able to contact that affect, they lost it again when they tried to relate to themselves as leaders. The leader described the group as unable to experience themselves as "bad" leaders and that they were in a hurry to get away from the simulation.

When the separation simulation was shown, the students had difficulty contacting their leader role. Most identified with the position of member. In that role, they saw a great deal about their typical behavior. When they did get in touch with their leader role, they again experienced the incongruity of their affect and behavior.

In general, the leader saw the simulations as evoking "gut reaction" from the participants. He noted that the participants were able to articulate their affective response more effectively through time. They learned about what was going on inside them as leaders. They seemed often to experience the incongruity between their feelings and their behavior regarding certain issues. The simulations seemed to help the students to recognize and assess process as occurring in groups.

The effectiveness of the class discussion, according to the leader, was as a sorting out process where many different ideas were shared.

VI. DISCUSSION

The discussion of this study will consider the creation of the video taped simulations, the try-out phase, and the field trial.

A. The Creation of the Video Taped Simulations

A great deal was learned about the making of video taped simulations during the actual taping procedure.

The character sketches which had been valuable to the authors in conceptualizing group members proved to be confining to the actors in the video taped group. When they tried to fit into described roles, they became less spontaneous. For that reason, the attempt to have the actors behave according to a prescribed role was abandoned early in the taping. Allowing the actors to be themselves was much more facilitative and accomplished the same goal as the character sketches because each actor had actually been selected because his real personality type represented one of the types described in the character sketches.

The character sketches had been given to the actors because the authors felt that the actors needed data out of which to play a role. In retrospect, it seems that more effective data might be provided by giving the actors details about the group--its setting, purpose, duration, etc. This kind of information would not only aid members in conceptualizing their roles, it would also result in the creation of a more consistent picture of the group being shown.

The authors noticed that on some occasions on the video tape, the group somewhat blatantly articulated the issues. For example, a member might actually say, "I'm feeling dependent and I want the leader to help me." While that message is the correct one to relay, the authors prefer less explicit articulation of the issue because the latter seems more realistic. The blatant statements seemed to occur when the actors were prepared for a video tape scene by being given the issue to portray with little stress being placed on the event to be acted out. When stress was placed on the event, the issue seemed to emerge naturally.

Awkwardness existed during the filming because of the absence of an actual leader. The actors had difficulty making statements directly at an imaginary leader. They would occasionally ask questions which required a response of the leader. The resulting silence was awkward.

The authors noted that video taping in the evening for three hours was strenuous for the actors; they seemed to lose their spontaneity toward the end of the session. Another disadvantage of that timing was that the group had no informal time to get to know one another and to evolve into an actual group.

Having the actors develop more fully into a group would have been an advantage since the actors would then have more history with which to play their roles.

While the taping procedure seemed to produce effective simulations, attention to the above-mentioned details might improve the product.

B. The Try-Out Phase

The results of asking judges to identify issues showed the difficulty of isolating issues in groups. Although it is commonly accepted that many different things are occurring in a group at the same time, it was difficult to create a scene which observers would agree showed a particular issue predominately.

On the other hand, once the simulations were labelled according to how a consensus of the judges viewed them, the participants, for the most part, agreed with the simulations label. These facts suggest the importance of a judging phase.

The responses to the question of the technical quality of the simulations seemed to yield little valuable information. The wide range of responses to the same simulation regarding the technical quality may be partly attributed to the judge with language difficulties, but the wide range of responses might also suggest that the judges were each defining "technical quality" differently. The judges might have been unclear, for example, about what presented difficulties for them in their observing of particular simulation.

It appears then that the responses to the question of the central issue in the simulations were valuable responses, for the most part. The responses to the technical quality rating of the simulations suggest that the question might have been interpreted in a variety of ways by the judges.

C. The Field Trial

The discussion of the field trial will be divided into the following areas: the materials, the participants, the group experience, the evaluation procedure, and the learning process.

The Materials

From the responses gathered from the participants, it appears that the creation of an affective response is central to the success of the materials. It seems clear that Competence/Trust I was less effective because it did not generate affect in the participants.

On the other hand, it may be that too much affect is also not good. The separation simulation is an illustration of this. Since the students observing the video tape were at the last session of the last class they would attend in the Counselor Education Program which they had attended for one and, in some cases, two years, they were feeling the effects of separation very strongly when they saw the video tape. It seemed that the heightened emotion which the viewing produced did more to immobilize the group than to generate problem solving energy. The participants reported great difficulty identifying with the leader role then and were moved to their own current separation rather than to their professional role in separation.

It seems that a simulation is effective if it can cause the viewer to feel a pressure to solve the problem created. Feeling pressured seems to create the motivation which is central to the effectiveness of the materials.

The simulations created for the field trial clearly served the need for which they were intended and were obviously seen as valuable by the participants. The students frequently mentioned the newness of placing themselves in a leader role and how they experienced events differently from that perspective. They described themselves as learning to see issues clearly which previously had been value notions read about or experienced as members. Apparently, the simple fact of being called a leader took on a growth producing function as the field trial progressed.

The comments on the process of the students' growth during the field trial suggest that some members learned to observe themselves as leaders and to observe groups in terms of issues in a relationship. This is apparent because the group and the leader reported decreasing reliance on the leader, increased self-initiated inquiry and improved observational techniques. In other words, they grew to rely less on help in following the learning model provided for them.

The participants reported that they learned most about themselves during the field trial. Although the learning was aimed at leader development, its use in personal or professional areas may depend on where the student is in his personal and professional development.

It may be that the goals of increasing awareness of affect and typical behavior, the learning of the implications of that behavior and some

alternative behaviors were too ambitious for an eight-session workshop. The students clearly felt that the last two objectives were not met. On the other hand, to limit the objectives of these materials to simply increasing affective awareness and to learning about typical behavior is to deny the full potential of the materials.

Perhaps more time than one session could be allowed for each simulation and discussion. More related activities such as psychodrama could be used so that students could act out alternatives; and more simulations showing the implications of the various modes of leader behavior could be shown.

One area of unresolved inquiry for the author is the role of the simulation versus the class discussion in the experience. It seems clear that the class discussion could not have proceeded as effectively without the use of the simulation material. And certainly the simulation without the model for class discussion would not have been as effective. The question still unanswered is which--the simulation or the class discussion--did what.

Participant response did not answer this question as hoped. On some occasions, participants would disagree about whether the simulation or the class discussion was responsible for certain kinds of learning which took place. Most of the time, the students attributed most of their learning equally to both. The Participants' Overall Reaction Sheet rated the class discussion slightly higher in all areas. The authors believe the students responded highest in that area because that was their area of active involvement. They were not aware of the impact of the simulation in triggering that class discussion.

These responses are difficult to interpret. For example, sometimes students would attribute the simulation and not the class discussion to their learning about alternative behaviors. It is difficult to see how that learning could have taken place without the class discussion. It is equally difficult to dismiss the role of the simulation in the creating of effect.

At this time, it does not seem possible to separate what occurred in the field trial in order to determine the role of the simulations versus the class discussion.

The Participants

It is important to look at some of the unique characteristics of the students involved in the field trial.

The class was made up of volunteers who had just completed a Masters degree program in counselor education. Many of them had just

been hired for jobs or were applying for jobs and said they felt inadequate about their work with groups. For this reason, the group was especially highly motivated.

In this group, there was an exceptionally high percentage of verbal, eager, and questioning students.

All of these students were dealing with separation from a rather intense interpersonal experience as students in a counselor education program. The field trial, in this respect, served as one last class to take together before leaving the department.

The group's composition was almost entirely white female. This may account for some dynamics in the group. Some members reported feeling free of competition for males in that group and instead, experienced a bond with the other women. So the homogenous sex grouping seemed to better risk-taking in the group.

This special composition of students eager for one more class may have attributed to some of the success of the field trial since this group was essentially highly motivated.

The Group Experience

One particular finding during the field trial is worthy of some discussion.

The students, the leader of the group, and the authors all noted that after observing a video tape, the student group often dealt within their group with the same issues which were manifest in the simulation just seen. This parallelism was striking on several occasions.

In the first session, the video taped group expressed concern about guidelines and the need for structure. The discussion in the student group which followed the viewing of that simulation dealt with, among other things, the procedures to be followed in the student group, the starting time, and other issues related to the setting of guidelines.

Just as the second video tape dealt with trust issues, the members of the student group questioned the role of their leader and noted that some members of their group were strangers they were not ready to trust.

In the third session, the group discussed what a leader should do when s/he experiences negative feelings for a member of the group. This discussion was in response to negative feelings students had for a member of the video taped group. Later in describing that session, the leader expressed ambivalence about dealing with his own negative feelings for a member of the student group.

In session four the student group became split over reactions to the leader's way of finally dealing with his negative feelings toward a member. The student group was also split on their assessment of what had occurred in the video taped group.

In the next two sessions, the video taped group becomes cohesive as discussions are characterized by very personal sharing on the part of the members. The student group also became involved in very intimate sharing and by the end of the sixth session, the leader experienced group pressure to conform to the majority opinion on alternative behaviors regarding the issue presented.

The student group's behavior does not parallel the video taped group in session seven. Here students report that they are unable to identify with that simulation. (Competence/Trust III is actually out of sequence in terms of what might occur in a group's development. Usually the kind of challenge of the leader which occurs in this simulation would occur much earlier in a group's life.)

Finally, the student group made plans to meet after the group ends so that the members would have another occasion to get together as the video taped group plans for later meetings.

The parallels which apparently existed between the video taped group and the student group suggest many possibilities for learning by the use of simulation in general and for training group leaders in particular.

Because the student group moved through the developmental phases in the exact same order and at exactly the same time as the video taped group, the students were much more aware of their own dynamics and they were better able to articulate what was happening to them and to the members of the video taped group. In effect, they were seeing and feeling the issues at the same time. This combination of cognitive and affective learning has the potential of a powerful learning device.

A similar effect is sometimes created when students are able to watch themselves in a group on video tape. The advantage of the design used in this study comes from the students' watching someone else. The result is that they can allow themselves to see behavior in someone else first which is more safe than seeing it in themselves. Another advantage of this design is that the teacher can control the process by selecting what the students will see. Students watching a video tape of themselves in effect control not only what they see (that is, what they will allow themselves to see of themselves) but what they do in the films. In this design the students see behavior which they might not own in themselves and then they recognize the behavior in themselves.

Several questions about the parallelism arise. To what extent does viewing a video tape of a group behaving in a certain manner trigger that behavior in the viewing group? Since much group theory literature addresses itself to the natural developmental stages of groups, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the video tapes triggered these stages in the viewing group. A study addressing itself to this question would be valuable. It may be found that simulations can alter the phases; this would show that a strong contagion between the filmed group and the student group exists. There seems to be, from this study, the possibility that use of simulation as a stimulus for learning in the affective area of interpersonal relations could be extensive.

There is also some question about how this parallelism can best be used to facilitate learning. As has been determined by the literature cited above, many theorists value the use of group participation as training for group leaders. Participation in this student group would have the heightened effect that comes with viewing a group experiencing what the students are actually experiencing.

The value for the students in the role of leader is more difficult to assess. In the field trial they seemed to vacillate between identifying themselves as members and as leaders. Sometimes they were unable to gain sufficient distance from the process to view it professionally.

It is the view of the authors that a skilled leader of the student group is needed in order to help the students bridge the gap between their role as a member of the student group and their role as leader of the video taped group. Since the student group is not a personal growth group itself, the energy stimulated by the experience needs to be harnessed for specific use in leader development.

It seems that the splitting of these two roles is at the core of potential effectiveness of these materials. What they seem to do best, which has not been done before, is to make use of the membership role to heighten student awareness by observation and participation and then use that awareness to increase the skill of the student as a leader of groups.

This method of training group leaders is different from the methods currently being used.

It teaches some of the same things traditionally learned through group membership but it does so in a more focused manner. As the students saw it, the video tapes served as common referrents. An added advantage of this design is that the teacher can manipulate what the students experience.

The simulations and class discussion can also be used to teach many of the didactic principles taught in group theory. Here the approach is from the experiential to the cognitive.

The Evaluation Procedure

Although each of the evaluation instruments produced similar results, there is some question about the validity of both the Participants' Rating Scale and the Participants' Reaction Sheet.

Since responses to all items on the rating scale were ranked nearly the same, there is some question as to how well the students differentiated between items. Perhaps more precise questions need to be asked. For example, when students were evaluating clarity, were they evaluating the pictorial clarity or the process clarity?

There were several difficulties with the Participants' Reaction Sheet. Students objected to having to respond to items on the basis of whether they impeded or facilitated. Clearly there are many alternative possibilities between these two extremes. Students objected to being forced to select one or two extreme positions.

One student also noted that the word choice of the reaction sheet was often technical. Words such as "simulation," "facilitated," "impede," etc. were used. Perhaps more simple language could have been used.

In addition to boredom, as the students described it and identification with being a group member, as the authors noted, it may be that the students resisted completing the form because they were unclear about what was being asked of them. It could also be that they did not like being forced to make such extreme choices as between facilitative and impeded. That theory would be consistent with the fact that student comments on the reaction sheet sometimes were not responsive to the questions asked. And finally, the students did say that the questions did not serve as a vehicle for allowing them to say what they thought was significant about the experience.

All in all, while the evaluation forms must have had some validity, since they produced consistent and congruent feedback on the field trial, the format of the questionnaires could be improved.

The Learning Process

It is important to examine the learning process during the field trial in order to learn about the value of simulation as a learning tool.

In all respects, these simulations demonstrated the advantages attributed to simulations in the literature cited above.

The ratings on the realism scale and the extent of student identification with the video tape group show that the simulations were accurate and believable models of personal growth groups. The authors attribute the accuracy of the model to the dynamics which grew out of the mix of actors selected for the simulation.

It was possible to control the experience of the students in the field trial to the extent that the issues which were brought up in the class discussion were predictable.

Literature on the value of simulation speaks of its worth as "self-paced" learning. In this case, the pacing, in part, took the form of whether the students dealt with the issues generated by the simulations from a personal or a professional point of view.

The high interest level usually associated with the use of simulations clearly existed in this study. Students described themselves as "energized" by the simulations.

Twelker describes "cue discrimination" as a kind of learning associated with simulation. In this case, the students began to observe groups in terms of the issues manifested.

Finally, it is in the area of integrating affective and cognitive learning in which these simulations appeared to be most effective. Discussion of the experience appears in the section "The Group Experience."

It seems clear that the value commonly attributed to learning by simulation existed in this study. It also seems that the use of simulation created a new and effective method of aiding in the training of group leaders.

VII. SUGGESTIONS

Many of the suggestions made below have been implied or stated above in the discussion; they have been included here in order to present a thorough statement of recommendations.

A. The Taping Procedure

If the taping were to be repeated, it might be helpful to do the taping over a longer period of time. This added time would allow the actors to develop a group feeling.

It would also be worthwhile to try placing more stress on the group setting and on the event to be simulated rather than specific issues as a means of preparing the actors.

Before future taping, the question of the position of the leader of the video taped group should be examined. Participants noted the effectiveness of conversation directed at the leader. Perhaps some new techniques could be devised so that her/his absence would not be awkward.

The authors preferred creating the simulations without a leader to avoid the possibility of students observing the video tape as evaluators of a leader's style. Creating some simulations with a leader present, however, would be a worthwhile alternative to try. Perhaps some way of alleviating the problem of the students' evaluating the leader's style could be found.

It appears that the selection of the actors was an important element in the making of the simulations. The actors' resistance to role-playing designated character types shows the importance of choosing people who will manifest the behavior desired in a natural manner. If they did not, the desired interaction would not occur.

B. The Try-Out Phase

It has been noted that the judging phase of the creation process seemed to be an important phase in evaluating the issues simulated.

Since affective response to the issues is central to the model, having the judges respond to the affect they experience may add significant information to the pre-trial testing. If a way of judging the viability of the simulations during the try-out phase could be devised, the resulting information would increase the possibility of learning before the field trial which simulations would be more effective learning tools.

C. The Materials

While the materials produced in this paper appear to be effective learning tools, some replication of this study is necessary in order to evaluate how the materials are useful and the extent of their usefulness.

This field trial pointed out the sequential value of the materials. It appears that students gained a great deal from observing the simulations in what represented a group's developmental pattern. (Notice should be made that in following that pattern, Competence/Trust III is out of order in the video tape and should appear sometime before Sexuality I when the group becomes cohesive.)

The use of the materials in non-sequential ways as described in the leader's manual would also be worthy of study. Assessment of their value when used in that manner is difficult to make at this time.

Another variation of this field trial might be the investigation of the use of the materials over an eight-week period as opposed to a four-day workshop.

It would also be interesting to intersperse simulations and class discussion with various student group role playing activities in order to reinforce and to clarify the learning occurring in the model already described.

While it was suggested for the participants that these materials were most effective for those participants who had already led groups, it might be interesting to examine the effectiveness of the materials on a group who had not led groups. This information might lead to determining other uses for the materials.

Student emphasis on the problem of a leader's negative feelings toward members of the group has brought to light another way of looking at this aspect of leader affect in a group. The material might be divided into that which refers to the affect leaders feel in their interpersonal relations with members and that which refers to the affect leaders experience while observing the interpersonal relations among members or, in general, the group dynamics.

Some re-examination of the materials created here and their use in this regard may help leaders to sort out their feelings in groups.

D. The Evaluation Procedure

If this evaluation procedure were to be used in the future, it would be recommended that both the Participants' Rating Scale and the Participants' Reaction Sheet be revised. The rating scale might be improved by the asking of more differentiated questions. The reaction sheet might be

improved by asking questions which would allow for a wider range of responses. The wording might also be changed to less technical language.

E. The Leader's Manual

Some re-examination of the leader's manual is necessary. At present, it is difficult to determine the role of the student group leader in the events of the field trial. This is an area for future study.

While one field trial does not provide sufficient data on the leader of the student group, the authors would suggest that the leader may need special training in addition to the manual as preparation for leading a student group.

The manual might also place more emphasis on the warming-up procedures to be followed by the leader before showing the video tape. It would be helpful if students were prepared for the watching of the video tape each time by some discussion of the video taped group, some discussion of what occurred the previous session, and by a reminder, as suggested by the participants, that they are to serve as leader. It might also be mentioned in the manual, again, as suggested by the participants, that some simulations need to be shown twice.

An aid to the effectiveness of the class discussion made by the participants is to have students write their reactions to the simulation before the class discussion begins. Some participants noted that the discussion had a kind of diluting effect on their own reactions. A written statement of a student's initial reaction to the simulation could then be compared with a student's feelings after the class discussion had been completed.

The conclusions reached on this study are that the materials created are worthwhile. Their value, however, needs to be more carefully studied by the use of subsequent field trials using some of the variations suggested above.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANTS' RATING SCALE

On the following scale, please rate your general reactions to the simulation experience you just observed.

Very useful	Useful	Of some use	Of little use	Useless

Very interesting	Interesting	Of some interest	Of little interest	Of no interest

Very realistic	Realistic	Rather realistic	Not very realistic	Not realistic at all

Very clear	Clear	Rather clear	Not very clear	Not clear at all

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS' REACTION SHEET

You have just been exposed to a simulation of and class discussion of _____ as manifested in a group.

Please answer the following questions regarding the simulation material and the subsequent class discussion.

1. Did the simulation material help you focus on the issue?

   A. If yes, how was the simulation facilitative?
   B. If no, how did the simulation impede focus on the issue?

2. Did the class discussion help you focus on the issue?

   A. If yes, how was the class discussion facilitative?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede focus on the issue?

3. Did the simulation material help you become more aware of your affect regarding this issue?

   A. If yes, how did the simulation material help you become more aware of your affect regarding this issue?
   B. If no, how did the simulation impede awareness of your affect regarding this issue?

4. Did the class discussion help you become more aware of your affect resulting from the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion increase awareness of your affect regarding this issue?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede awareness of your affect regarding this issue?

5. Did the simulation material help you become more aware of your typical behavior resulting from the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the simulation material help you become more aware of your typical behavior resulting from the issue simulated?
   B. If no, how did the simulation material impede awareness of your typical behavior regarding this issue?

6. Did the class discussion help you become more aware of your typical behavior regarding the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help you become more aware of your typical behavior regarding the issue simulated?

B. If no, how did the class discussion impede awareness of typical behavior regarding this issue?

7. Did the class discussion help you consider some of the implications of your possible behavior?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help you become more aware of the implications of your possible behavior?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede awareness of the implications of possible behaviors?

8. Did the class discussion help you consider alternative behaviors?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help you consider alternative behaviors?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede consideration of alternative behaviors?

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL REACTION SHEET

Please rate the simulation materials by marking the appropriate description:

The simulation materials helped me to recognize issues between members and the leader of a group:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The simulation materials helped me to become more aware of my affect resulting from these issues:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The simulation materials helped me become more aware of my typical behavior resulting from these issues:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The simulation materials helped me to consider some implications of my possible behavior:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The simulation materials helped me to consider alternative behaviors:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

APPENDIX D

TRY-OUT REACTION SHEET

Please answer the following questions regarding the simulation material you have just observed.

1. Simulation number _____

2. Was the central issue demonstrated in the simulation dependency, competence/trust, hostility, sexuality, or separation?

   _____

3. What other issues did you observe? (Please place them in rank order with the most obvious first.)

   _____

Rate the simulation by marking the appropriate description:

/	/	/	/	/
Very Interesting	Interesting	Of some interest	Of little interest	Of no interest

/	/	/	/	/
Very realistic	Realistic	Rather realistic	Not very realistic	Not realistic

/	/	/	/
Technically well done	Technically acceptable	Technically fair	Technically poor

Please rate the class discussion by marking the appropriate description:

The class discussion helped me to recognize issues between members and and the leader of a group:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The class discussion helped me to become more aware of my affect resulting from these issues:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The class discussion helped me to consider some implications of my possible behavior:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

The class discussion helped me to consider alternative behaviors:

Very helpful	Helpful	Of little help	Not helpful at all

Other comments regarding the simulation materials and the class discussion: (Continue on the back if necessary)

APPENDIX E

LEADER REACTION SHEET

Students in your class were just exposed to a simulation of and class discussion of _____ as manifested in a group.

Please answer the following questions regarding the simulation material and the subsequent class discussion on the basis of what appeared to occur in your class.

1. Did the simulation material help the students focus on the issue?

   A. If yes, how was the simulation facilitative?
   B. If no, how did the simulation impede focus on the issue?

2. Did the class discussion help the students focus on the issue?
   A. If yes, how was the class discussion facilitative?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede focus on the issue?

3. Did the simulation material help the students become more aware of their affect resulting from the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the simulation material help students become more aware of their affect regarding this issue?
   B. If no, how did the simulation impede awareness of affect regarding this issue?

4. Did the class discussion help the students become more aware of their affect resulting from the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help students become more aware of their affect regarding this issue?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede awareness of affect regarding this issue?

5. Did the simulation material help the students become more aware of their typical behavior resulting from the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the simulation material help students become more aware of their typical behavior resulting from the issue simulated?
   B. If no, how did the simulation material impede awareness of typical behavior regarding this issue?

6. Did the class discussion help the students become more aware of their typical behavior regarding the issue simulated?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help students become more aware of their typical behavior regarding the issue simulated?

B. If no, how did the class discussion impede awareness of typical behavior regarding this issue?

7. Did the class discussion help the students consider some of the implications of their possible behavior?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help students become more aware of the implications of their possible behavior?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede awareness of the implications of possible behaviors?

8. Did the class discussion help students consider alternative behaviors?

   A. If yes, how did the class discussion help students consider alternative behaviors?
   B. If no, how did the class discussion impede consideration of alternative behaviors?

APPENDIX F

LEADER'S MANUAL

The purpose of this leader's manual is to provide teachers of group leadership with background information on, procedure for, and various uses for the accompanying simulation materials and subsequent class discussion.

I. Objective

The primary intention of the simulations and subsequent class discussion is to aid students of group leadership in becoming more aware of the affect generated in them as a consequence of being involved in the member/leader relationship in personal growth groups.

While many theorists consider the member/leader relationship to be the core of personal growth groups, most literature on this subject stresses the affect of the group members, not that of the leader of the group.

The accompanying video tapes along with class discussion will aid in moving students from an affective to a cognitive awareness of the leader's involvement in the member/leader relationship. Since the movement is from the experiential to the cognitive, the theorizing about what is most appropriate at the end of the class discussion after students have gathered information about themselves as group leaders in a particular situation.

The class discussion would proceed from inside the student leader outside. Attention would be drawn first to how s/he feels inside when s/he assumes the role of leader of the group depicted in the video tape. The attention then would move to how s/he typically behaves when feeling that way. Next, the focus would be expanded to the group depicted in the video tape to consider the consequences of possible leader behavior, and finally, attention would be placed on what has been occurring in the group as it relates to groups in general.

II. Time

The introduction by the teacher, the viewing of a simulation and the class discussion should require approximately two hours.

III. Size

The kind of experience generated by the viewing of the simulation and the class discussion would be appropriate for a group of between eight and fifteen students.

IV. Numbering

The numbers given each simulation can serve as identification numbers; they also designate the footage on the video tape reel.

V. Procedure

A. The showing of the simulation video tape would follow these steps:

1. Students are told that they are about to study issues or an issue involved in their relationship with the members of a group. Focus will be on the affect generated in them while they are, vicariously, through the use of the video tape, involved in that relationship.

2. Before viewing the film, students are asked to assume the position of leader of the group they are about to see.

3. Students are then introduced to the situation simulated in the group. The information given in the section titled "For the Students" describes what the students should be told beforehand. They should not be told of the issue simulated.

4. Students view the simulation.

B. The conducting of the class discussion after viewing the simulation would follow from these questions:

1. As leader of the group, how did you feel? (The teacher might encourage students to be aware of and to respond to the mood of the group. Related questions might be: How is the group being? What does that do to you emotionally as leader?)

2. How might you behave in that situation? (This question should be asked after members have determined their emotional response so that the question becomes: When you feel that way, what do you generally do? It might be helpful to ask students to get in touch with similar interpersonal situations in which they have experienced that particular emotion so that they can better identify how they might behave.)

Questions 3, 4 and 5 move toward a cognitive learning process.

3. What might be the consequences of your behavior in the group?

4. What are some alternative behaviors? (In considering questions #3 and #4, responses might be grouped into three categories: Would you, as leader, be supporting, reflecting, or confronting? What kind of affect might each category of response elicit?)

5. Finally, if it isn't explicit at this time, the teacher might ask students to define the predominate issues occurring in the group. (Here students are asked to focus on the cognitive by considering the ways groups relate to the leader and the total group process and the theoretical view of that behavior.)

VI. Introduction to the Simulations and Use

A. Simulation number 050: Dependency

This sequence occurs early in the group's development when members are unsure of their roles and that of the leader. The dependency of the group is demonstrated mainly in the questioning of the appropriateness of topics for discussion.

For the Students: Students should know that the sequence does occur early in the group's life and that the particular session begins as a member brings up an immediate disturbance which has just occurred between her and her child.

B. Simulation number 133: Hostility I

Here members of the group become frustrated by their dependency on the leader; their frustration leads to hostility among members as they question the purpose of the group and individual expectations.

For the Students: Students should be told that this segment occurs part way through a group session after members have wandered through various topics trying to find appropriate group behavior.

C. Simulation number 161: Competence/Trust I

This session begins as a member informs the group that she has learned that a fellow member who was absent the previous week, Mary, has chosen to withdraw from the group. The group reacts to this information.

For the Students: Students should be told that the group has existed for a few weeks now. One member, Mary, who was absent the previous week, has chosen to withdraw from the group. The video tape begins after a member explains that she called Mary and found out that Mary isn't coming back to the group.

D. Simulation number 221 and 243: Hostility II

This vignette can be used in two different ways. The teacher may choose to use only the first half of the simulation to demonstrate hostility in a group which takes the form of bickering between and among members. In this way, the teacher would stop the film after the line, "Not that I'm going to tell you."

The simulation may be shown from beginning to end, and in that case, students will see both the bickering and the way the hostility is then diffused by the group. In the first case, the student leaders would focus on their affect and behavior as a consequence of the bickering; in the second, on their affect and behavior as a consequence of the diffusion of the hostility.

For the Students: No background information needs to be given for this simulation.

E. Simulation number 280: Competence/Trust

This vignette begins showing the group well into normative behavior. Members congratulate one another for behaving within the group's cultural patterns. When it becomes apparent that one member is violating the code implicitly established by the group, inter-member trust is questioned.

For the Students: Students should be told that in the previous group session, one member attacks another member for dominating the group. The attacker has been consistently hostile throughout the group and in this session, he apologizes.

F. Simulation number 410: Sexuality I

The central event in this session is one member's revealing of his homosexuality.

For the Students: No background information is needed.

G. Simulation number 485: Sexuality II

The central event in this vignette is the exposing of sexual feelings toward the leader and between members.

For the Students: No background information is needed.

H. Simulation number 546: Competence/Trust III

For the Students: Before viewing this simulation, students should be told that the group is shown here waiting for the leader to arrive. Students are to assume that when the leader does arrive, s/he will be confronted with the feelings the members depict in the video tape.

I. Simulation number 584: Separation

Here the group demonstrates the typical sentimental feelings and denial which are associated with termination.

For the Students: No background information is needed.

VII. Variations

Aside from the purpose and procedure described above, these video tapes can be used for a variety of other purposes. While they do not need to be used sequentially, they could be used to follow the developmental pattern of groups. Since many theorists see the issues in the member/leader relationship emerging along developmental lines, a sequential pattern is possible. It would follow the use of the issues of dependency and competence/trust first followed by hostility and sexuality and ending with separation.

Using a developmental model, it would be possible to parallel the development of the group taking the course in group leadership with the development of the group in the video tape and finally to some general theories of group development. Aside from some back-stepping, the video taped group passes through a period first of questioning of purpose to a period of normative patterns in which individual sharing occurs, and finally, the group moves to a stage of denial and sadness as the group ends.

Other use of the video tapes can be made by using them individually rather than in a series. A video taped simulation might be used to highlight problem areas previously pinpointed by a class; or one might be used to respond to what is occurring in a particular class.

It is also possible for students to study particular members of the group on the video tape. For example, students might study the member who begins as a hostile participant and who eventually seeks acceptance in ways more acceptable to the group. Another member demonstrates the effects of a group member who dilutes all experiences. Students might be asked to identify with a member and follow that person through each simulation.

The video taped simulations can be used, then, in a series for a variety of purposes or individual stimulations can be used for specific purposes.

APPENDIX G

SIMULATION SCRIPTS

Dependency Simulation

Dep: I'm feeling terrible. When I got ready to come here tonight, my two year old, for the first time, went crazy about my leaving. He pleaded with me to stay home. I didn't know what to do.

S: What did you do?

Dep: It just got awful. When he first started it, I sat down and talked a few minutes then got worried about missing my bus. And when I started to leave again, he actually threw his arms around my leg and wouldn't let me walk. It was awful. I was even walking around dragging him. Finally, I had to pull his arms off and leave him sitting on the floor crying.

Int: I think that's O.K. You have to let them know early that you have a life of your own.

Pla: Maybe it's the right thing to do but I could never do that with mine. I always stayed home. Maybe I was wrong.

Hos: My mother always dropped me off with babysitters and I remembered being scared to death, but I lived through it.

S: There must be a better way of doing it. I'd really like to know.

Fac: Has anyone else but me noticed that our leader hasn't entered into this discussion?

Dep: Maybe it's not the right thing to bring up in a group like this; I realize some of you don't even have children. It was just on my mind.

Pa: We haven't been told what we are supposed to talk about. We've never been given any rules or guidelines.

S: It's true. If we could just pick our own topics and talk then what do we need a leader for? This wouldn't be any different than a bunch of people getting together and having a discussion.

Ind: I think we should pick own own topics. How can someone else know what we are concerned with?

Pla: That may be true later but right now, it's really hard for us to talk to each other and we're not exactly sure where we're trying to get to at this point. It would be a waste of time if we analyzed each other.

S: I really wish you would set us straight about this. We're going round and round about this.

Competence/Trust Simulation

Pa: I want to react to last week's session. I think some things got a little out of hand there and maybe some people's feelings were hurt and I think we could be a little more careful about what's said in here.

Ind: That's funny. I thought last week was one of the best. I thought we cleared the air about a lot of things.

Pa: I just mean if that kind of thing continues, it may lead to a lot of hurt feelings. What went on itself wasn't that bad, but what it might lead to could become a problem.

Fac: Well, let's ask _____, how she felt about it: after all, she was the one involved.

Pa: Well, that's hard to say. I mean I'm sure later when I look back on it, I'll be glad it happened, but I really don't want this session to be a repeat of the last. I don't want all the attention to focus on me again. Let's talk about someone else.

Silence.

Pa: Does anyone know anyone who went to that humen development institute cross town? I have a friend who went there. Dr. _____led his group. He's one of the founders of that place. According to my friend, her experience wasn't anything like this group.

S: I don't think that place is any good. I heard about this group for couples they had; it was one of their first groups and people had to tell all kinds of personal stuff about their sex lives and everything, you know. Two of those couples got divorced since then.

Pa: Wasn't that Harry and Judy Anderson? Who were the others?

S: I don't remember.

Int: So what are you doing here if you don't believe in groups?

S: I didn't say that. It's that human development place I was talking about. Anyway, I was curious. I thought I'd just try it and see what it was like.

Int: Maybe groups like this are only good for certain things.

S: I'm really surprised at how intelligent some of the members of this group are.

Ind: I think these groups are what you make them; I really wonder if anything else matters.

Int: Maybe that't true about the importance of each person but I'm sure the mix of people and the leader make a difference, too.

Hostility Simulation

Begins with silence.

Pa: Why don't we all put our heads down and go to sleep?

Fac: Or maybe we could go somewhere else--to a bar, or something, why sit here?

Pa: I remember when I was in grade school, there was this dancing teacher who came to gym class and she's trying to get us to volunteer. The kids would just sit there and look at her. Finally, she had to just pick people.

Silence.

Hos: I'm beginning to think we're all guinea pigs in an experiment of yours. You have a lot to gain here, but what about us?

Int: You say that a lot about thinking everybody's a guinea pig.

Hos: I'm not talking to you; I'm talking to our leader.

Int: But I'm talking to you, and I say you're always trying to pick a fight. You're always arguing and complaining.

Hos: That's better than you. You sit there apouting off information like from a book.

Pla: I believe there's some purpose in this; that's why I sit here.

Hos: There's a lot of quiet members like you here, but you people aren't running this group.

Ind: To tell you the truth I'm beginning to feel a little uncomfortable here too. I'm sitting here waiting for something to happen. And I am bothered when you just sit here looking at us.

Hos: That's right. And there are people here with problems: no one is getting any answers.

Fac: Maybe we need to be more specific about what we need. I'm assuming people have problems but I don't know what they are. I'm not even sure I know what mine are.

Dep: I'll tell you what I want. I need some help for my sister. She's always getting herself into so much trouble and then she comes to me to bail her out. I don't know what to do at this point.

Silence.

Hos: See. What good did that do? You don't even ask her any questions. You don't even give her some direction. I have to be honest and say I don't like the way things are going here.

Pla: I don't think it's right for you to talk like that. You should be more careful about what you say. Anyway, you really have to give this group a chance.

Int: I disagree. Telling people about your feelings is a good thing. And I'm glad you said that because I was feeling much the same way but I just didn't have the nerve to say it.

Sexuality Simulation

Group begins with small talk.

Dep: You know, we've really come a long way in this group. We somehow get ourselves started now and really do get to important issues.

S: This group has really helped me. And I attribute it all to you. As leader, you really helped me look at what I'm doing. You'd be surprised how much freer I feel. So often I think of your words as I go through the day.

Fac: This seems to be the night for patting ourselves on the back.

S: I'm really tired of your comments like that. It's like your always trying to take over the leader's job. You never say anything about yourself and really the leader can take care of commenting on the group much better than you.

Dep: Well, I guess I'm going to get clobbered by you too, but you do seem to have a lot to say about how fabulous our leader is.

S: I'm just for the underdog, that's all.

Pa: How is <u>he</u> the unde dog?

S: What do you mean, all those times we all picked on him.

Separation Simulation

Begins with some small talk.

Fac: All the time we've been talking, I kept thinking back to how different we are now than we were at the beginning. I think of how scared I was of all of you and how we all just sat here struggling to come up with something to say. I'm thinking now that it was worth the struggle.

Ind: For me, too. For me the best part is feeling so close to all of you. I feel I really know you.

Int: I'm troubled by how realistic all of this is, though. I mean when can you ever have this kind of relationship with people outside of this group? People outside never sit around and talk like this to each other.

Pla: I guess I feel pushed to get this kind of thing started with people outside this group, but frankly, I'm a follower. I'm really afraid that I'll fall into my old ruts with my friends outside this group.

Hos: I don't have that problem at all. I have a lot of unanswered questions yet, and I'm bothered with all this reverence for this group now. It seems phoney to me.

Fac: In a way I see what you mean. I guess I expected more tangible answers too.

Int: I don't see where all this is getting us. Why don't we get into using the group for what we want.

Dep: You know, all along we were led to believe we had a free choice in what happened here. Well, I think we've really started fitting into a mold. We all start sounding the same and each session is like part of the same pattern. What gets me is that there is a certain thing expected of us from the start and yet we're never told what it is; I don't see the value of all that struggle we went through.

Pla: I'm really surprised to hear you say that. All along I thought you were really satisfied with what's been happening.

Dep: Well, I went along with what happened, that's all. When people complained about this sort of thing, we were told we were wrong, that there were no specific expectations of us. I believed it but now when I see what's happened, I really wonder.

APPENDIX H

CHARACTER SKETCHES

Placator:

Serves as a helper in the group, specially helpful to the leader:
A pleaser, friendly, non-violent, often the arbitrator, likes people;
"I try hard to do whatever people want me to do. I want things to go smoothly."

Hostile:

Openly aggressive, a complainer, skeptical, blameful, resentful; "No one can help me. Life is tough."

Facilitator:

Identifies with the leader;
Places himself between the group and the leader, tries to be the intermediary, feels superior to and different from group;
Aspires to lead groups;
Often makes process comments;
"I notice the leader's contributions to this group are different from other people's."

Dependent:

Wants to be taken care of;
Presents self as fragile, naive, confused;
Exaggerated sensitivity;
"Often I'm not really sure about what's going on within me; others know me better than I know myself."

Passive Aggressive:

Makes seemingly bland statements which conceal negativism;
Usually understates how he feels;
"It's not that I don't like what's going on, but you can never be too careful."

Seducer:

Seeks intimacy and companionship;
Overly needful;
Sexually aggressive;
"I owe you a lot; you've done a lot for me."

Intellectual:

Believes reasoning will bring truth;
Often the judge, feels superior;
Quotes authorities, gives information;
"I figure out the answers to questions by weighing the various possibilities, there's always right answer."

Independent:

His own person;
Looks inside himself for what's right for him'
Not a crowd pleaser;
"I alone must determine what's best for me."

APPENDIX I

TRY-OUT TABULATIONS

Judges	Issues	Inters Very	Int.	Some	Little	No	Realism Very	Real	Rather	Not very	Not at all	Technical well	acc.	fair	poor	No
1	DEPENDENCY hostility attention omnipotency		x					x					x			050
2	HOSTILITY Dependency		x					x					x			
3	DEPENDENCY Comp/Trust Hostility		x									x				
1	HOSTILITY AND COMP/TRUST		x					x							x	161
2	TRUST/COMP Dependency		x				x					x				
3	COMP/TRUST Dependency Hostility		x					x				x				

APPENDIX I--Continued

Judges	Issues	Interest Very	Int.	Some	Little	No	Realism Very	Real	Rather	Not very	Not at all	Technical Well	Acc.	Fair	Poor	No.
1	HOSTILITY Sexuality		x					x						x		221
2	HOSTILITY	x						x					x			
3	HOSTILITY	x					x					x				
1	SEXUALITY Attention Leadership			x				x					x			243
2	HOSTILITY Trust Sexuality		x					x					x			
3	HOSTILITY Dependency	x						x				x				
1	TRUST Sexuality Dependency Competition	x					x							x		280
2	TRUST Hostility Support Defensiveness	x						x						x		
3	DEPENDENCY Sexuality	x					x					x				

03

APPENDIX I--Continued

Judges	Issues	Interest Very	Int.	Some	Little	No	Realism Very	Real	Rath.	Not very	Not at all	Technical Well	Acc.	Fair	Poor	No.
1	SEXUALITY Trust		x					x						x		410
2	SEXUALITY		x				x						x			
3	TRUST Hostility	x					x					x				
1	TRUST Pairing Sexuality	x						x							x	485
2	HOSTILITY Sexuality Competence		x					x					x			
3	SEXUALITY Hostility		x					x				x				
1	DEPENDENCY Competence Hostility		x					x						x		546
2	COMP/TRUST Hostility		x					x					x			
3	COMPETENCE Hostility		x					x					x			

APPENDIX I--Continued

Judges	Issues	Interest Very	Int.	Some	Little	No	Realism Very	Real	Rath.	Not very	Not at all	Technical Well	Acc.	Fair	Poor	No.
1	SEPARATION			x			x						x			594
2	SEPARATION Defensiveness		x				x						x			
3	SEPARATION Dependency	x					x					x				

APPENDIX J

PARTICIPANTS' RATING SCALE TABULATIONS

	Usefulness	Interest	Realism	Clarity
0 Very	5	5	7	7
Useful	9	9	5	5
Some Use			2	2
Little				
No				
1 Very	3	2	3	2
Useful	4	9	5	6
Some Use	5		2	3
Little	1	2	3	2
No				
1 Very	5	5	4	4
Useful	7	7	8	8
Some Use	1	1	1	1
Little				
No				
0 Very	6	6	4	3
Useful	4	5	4	5
Some Use	1	1	3	4
Little	1		1	
No				
0 Very	8	8	9	8
Useful	5	6	5	4
Some Use	1			2
Little				
No				
5 Very	7	6	8	7
Useful	3	4	2	3
Some Use	1	1	1	1
Little				
No				
6 Very	4	5	6	5
Useful	6	5	3	6
Some Use	3	3	2	
Little Use			2	2
No				
8 Very	8	7	9	8
Useful	3	4	2	4
Some Use	1	1	1	
Little				
No				

∞

APPENDIX K

PARTICIPANTS' REACTION SHEET TABULATIONS

	#050 Sim Class		#161 Sim Class		#221 Sim Class		#280 Sim Class		#410 Sim Class		#485 Sim Class		#546 Sim Class		#584 Sim Class	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Focus on the issue	14	0	14	0	11	2	11	1	13	0	11	2	9	3	11	1
	14	0	13	1	11	0	12	0	12	2	14	0	11	0	12	0
Increased awareness of affect	11	2	13	1	7	6	13	0	12	1	13	0	11	1	9	3
	10	4	10	2	10	2	12	0	12	2	13	0	10	2	12	0
Increased awareness of typical behavior	10	3	13	1	10	3	11	2	11	2	11	2	11	0	10	1
	12	0	11	0	10	1	12	2	13	1	8	4	11	0	10	2
Increased awareness of implications of behavior	10	3			12	1			11	2			11	0		
	13	1			10	1			11	3			11	0		
Increased awareness of alternative behaviors	12	2			12	1			13	0			10	1		
	14	0			7	5										

APPENDIX I.

PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL REACTION SHEET TABULATIONS

	Simulation				Class Discussion			
	Very Helpful	Little	No help		Very Helpful	Little	No help	
Recognition of the Issue	10	2			12			
Awareness of Affect	7	4	1		10	2		
Awareness of Typical Behavior	9	2	1		10	1	1	
Awareness of Implications of Behavior	8	2	2		10	1	1	
Awareness of Alternative Behavior	7	2	2	1	11	1		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anthony, E. J. "The History of Group Psychotherapy." In H. I. Kaplan and B. J. Sadock (eds.). Sensitivity Through Encounter and Marathon. New York: Dulton and Company, Inc. (1972) :1-26.

Bach, G. R. "Discussion." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 18 (1968) :244-249.

_____. Intensive Group Psychotherapy. New York: Ronald, 1954.

Balgopal, P. R. "Variations in Sensitivity Training Groups." Perspectives in Psychiatric Care II, No. 2 (1973) :80-86.

Barnett, P. W. "Trust in Interpersonal Communication, May 1973." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, May 1973.

Benne, K. D. "From Polarization to Paradox in T-Group." In L. P. Bradford; J. R. Gibb; and K. D. Benne. T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964, 216-247 (A).

_____. "History of the T-Group in the Laboratory Setting." In L. P. Bradford; J. R. Gibb; and K. D. Benne. T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964, 80-135 (B).

Bennis, W. G. "Patterns and Vicissitudes in T-Group Development." In L. P. Bradford; J. R. Gibb; and K. D. Benne. T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964 248-278.

Bennis, W. G. and Shepard, H. A. "A Theory of Group Development." Human Relations 9 (1956) :415-437.

Beukenkamp, C. and Berger, M. "Training in Group Psychotherapy: A Symposium." American Journal of Psychotherapy 12, No. 3 (July 1958) :3-13.

Bion, W. R. Experiences in Groups. New York: Basic Books, 1961.

Blank, L. "Confrontation Techniques--A Two-Sided Coin." In L. Blank; G. B. Gottsegen; and M. G. Gottsegen (eds.). Confrontation Encounters in Self and Interpersonal Awareness. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971, 499-507.

Brayboy, T. L. "The Black Patient in Group Therapy." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 21 (1971):288-293.

Burton, A. (ed.). Encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Campbell, J. P. and Dunnette, M. D. "Effectiveness of T-Group Experiences in Managerial Training and Development." Psychiatric Bulletin 70 (1968) :73-102.

Carkuff, R. Helping and Human Relations: A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers, Volume I: Selection and Training. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Cartwright, D. and Zander, A. (eds.). Group Dynamics Research and Theory. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1953.

Coffey, H. S.; Freedman, M.; Leary, T.; and Ossorio, A. "A Technique of Group Psychotherapy." Journal of Social Issues 6, No. 1 (1950) :25-36.

Cohn, R. C. "Group Therapeutic Techniques as Educational Means in the Training of Psychoanalysists." Topic Problem in Psychotherapy 5. New York: Karger/Basel, 1965, 48-58.

_____. "A Group-Therapeutic Workshop in Countertransference." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 11, No. 3 (1961) :284-296.

Dies, R. R. "Attitudes Toward the Training of Group Psychotherapists: Some Interprofessional and Experience--Associated Differences." Small Group Behavior 5, No. 1 (February 1974) :65-79.

_____. "Group Therapist Self-Disclosure: An Evaluation by Clients." Journal of Counseling Psychiatry 20, No. 4 (July 1973) :344-352.

Dunphy, D. C. "Phases, Roles, and Myths in Self-Analytic Groups." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 4, No. 2 (1968) :195-225.

_____. "Social Change in Self-Analytic Group." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Harvard University, 1964.

Egan, G. Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Fiedler, F. E. "Personality and Situational Determinants of Leadership Effectiveness." In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.). Group Dynamics Research and Theory. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1953, 362-380.

Fitch, J. M. "The Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Simulation Materials for the Training of Counseling Supervisors." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1975.

Forer, B. R. "Therapeutic Relationships in Groups." In A. Burton (ed.). Encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, 27-41.

Fox, R. S. and Lippett, R. "The Innovation of Classroom Mental Health Practices." In M. B. Miles (ed.). Innovations in Education. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1964, 271-297.

Freud, S. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. New York: Liveright, 1949.

Gibb, C. A. "Definition of the Leader." In C. G. Kemp, (ed.). Perspectives on the Group Process. A Foundation for Counseling with Groups. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964, 156-162.

Gibb, J. R. "Fear and Facade: Defensive Management." In F. Farson (ed.). Science and Human Affairs. Palo-Alto, California: Science and Behavior, 1965.

_____. "Meaning of the Small Group Experience." In L. N. Solomon and B. Berzon (eds.). New Perspectives on Encounter Groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972, 1-12.

Gibb, J. R. and Gibb, L. M. "Role Freedom in a FORI Group." In A. Burton (ed.). Encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, 42-57.

Gibbard, G. S.; Hartman, J. J.; and Mann, R. D. (eds.). Analysis of Groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1974.

Goldberg, C. Encounter: Group Sensitivity Training Experience. New York: Science House, Inc. 1970.

Gordon, M. and Liberman, N. "Group Psychotherapy: Being and Becoming." Personnel and Guidance Journal 49, No. 8 (April 1971), 611-617.

Gottschalk, L. A. "Psychoanalytic Notes on T-Groups as the Human Relations Laboratory, Bethel, Maine." Comprehensive Psychiatry 7 (December 1966) :472-487.

Gross, S. L. "Simulation Materials for Training Learning Development Consultants." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973.

Grotjahn, M. "The Qualities of the Group Therapist." In H. Kaplan and B. J. Sardock (eds.). Sensitivity Through Encounter and Marathon. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1972, 191-207.

Hadden, S. B. "Countertransference in the Group Psychotherapist." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 3, No. 4 (October 1953) :417-423.

Harren, V. A. "A Model for Co-Therapy in Groups." Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Conference, Washington, D.C., August 31-September 4, 1969. American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September, 1969.

Hartman, J. J. and Gibbard, G. S. "Anxiety Boundard Evaluation and Social Change." In G. S. Gibbard; J. J. Hartman; and R. D. Mann (eds.). Analyses of Groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974, 1954-176.

_____. "The Bi-sexual Fantasy and Group Process." Contemporary Psychoanalysis 9, 1973, 303-322.

Hinckley, R. G. and Hermann, L. Group Treatment in Psychotherapy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.

Horwitz, L. "Transference in Training and Therapy Groups." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 14 (1964) :202-213.

House, R. J. "T-Group Education Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of the Empirical Literature and a Critical Evaluation." In R. Golenbiewski and A. Blumberg (eds.). Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Approach. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1970.

Howard, J. Please Touch: A Guided Tour of the Human Potential Movement. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1970.

Jacobs, M.: Jacobs, A.; Gatz, M.; and Schaible, T. "Credibility and Desirability of Positive and Negative Structured Feedback in Groups." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 40, No. 2 (1973) :244-252.

Johnson, D. W. Reaching Out Interpersonal Effectiveness and Self-Actualization. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Johnson, J. Group Therapy: A Practical Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Jones, M.; McPherson, F.; Whitaker, D. S.; Sutherland, J. D.; Walton, H.; and Wolff, H. Small Group Psychotherapy. Middlesex, England: Harmondsworth, 1971.

Jourard, S. The Transparent Self. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1971.

Kaplan, H. I. and Sadock, B. J. (eds.). Sensitivity Through Encounter and Marathon. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1972.

Kibel, H. D. "Interracial Conflicts as Resistance in Group Psychotherapy." American Journal of Psychotherapy 26 (1972) :555-562.

Kotkov, B. "Vicissitudes of Student Group Therapists." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 6, No. 48 (1956) :48-52.

Lakin, M. "Group Sensitivity Training and Encounter." The Counseling Psychologist 2, No. 2 (1970) :66-70.

_____. Interpersonal Encounter: Theory and Practice in Sensitivity Training. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1972.

_____. "Some Ethical Issues in Sensitivity Training." American Psychologist 24 (1969) :923-928.

Lakin, M.; Lieberman, M. A.; and Whitaker, D. S. "Issues on the Training of Group Psychotherapists." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 29, Nos. 1-4 (1969) : 307-325.

Lippitt, G. L. and This, L. E. "Leaders for Lab Training: Selected Guidelines for Group Trainers Utilizing the Lab Method." Training and Development Journal 21, No. 3 (March 1967) :2-13.

Loeser, L. H. and Bry, T. "The Position of the Group Therapist in Transference and Countertransference: An Experiemental Study." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 3, No. 4 (October 1953) :389-406.

Lubin, B. and Eddy, W. B. "The Laboratory Training Model: Rationale Methods and Some Thoughts in the Future." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 20 (July 1970) :305-339.

Lundgren, D. C. "Trainer Style and Patterns of Group Development." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 7, No. 6 (1971) :689-709.

McGee, T. F.; Racusen, F. R.; and Schuman, B. N. "Termination in Group Psychotherapy." American Journal of Psychotherapy 26 (1972) :521-532.

Maliver, B. L. The Encounter Game. New York: Stein and Day, 1971.

Mann, R. D. "The Development of Member/Trainer Relationship in Self Analytic Groups." Human Relations 19 (1966) :85-115.

Mann, R. D. in collaboration with Gibbard, G. S. and Hartman, J. J. Interpersonal Styles and Group Developments: An Analysis of the Member/Leader Relationship. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Maslow, A. "The Need to Know and the Fear of Knowing." Journal of General Psychology 68 (1963) :111-125.

Massarik, F. "Standards for Group Leadership." In Solomon, L. and Berzon, B. (eds.). New Prospectives on Encounter Groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972, 68-82.

Mills, T. M. "Authority and Group Emotion." In W. C. Bennis; E. H. Schein; D. E. Berlew; and F. I. Steele (eds.). Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays and Readings on Human Interaction. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964, 94-108.

Montgomery, L. J. "The Sensitivity Movement: Questions to be Researched." Small Group Behavior 4, No. 4 (November 1973) :387-406.

Mowrer, O. H. The New Group Therapy. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1964.

Mullan, H. "Countertransference in Groups." American Journal of Psychotherapy 7 (1953) :680-688.

_____. "Status Denial in Group Psychoanalysis." The Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases 122, No. 4 (October 1955) :345-352.

Mullan, H. and Rosenbaum, M. Group Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Parloff, M. "Group Therapy and Small-Group Field: An Encounter." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 20, No. 3 (1970) :267-304.

_____. "Group Therapy and the Small-Group Field: An Encounter." In H. I. Kaplan and B. J. Sadock (eds.). Sensitivity Through Encounter and Marathon. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1972, 149-171.

Paul, L. "Some Ethical Principles for Facilitators." Journal of Humanistic Psychotherapy 13, No. 1 (Winter, 1973) :43-46.

Powdermaker, F. B. and Frank, J. D. Group Psychotherapy Studies in Methodology of Research and Therapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Redl, F. "Group Emotion and Leadership." Psychiatry 5 (1942) :573-596.

Redlich, F. C. and Astrachan, B. M. "Group Dynamics Training." American Journal of Psychiatry 125 (May 1969) :1501-1507.

Rogers, C. R. Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

_____. "Dealing with Psychological Tensions." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 1 (1965) :6-25.

_____. "Process of the Basic Encounter Group." Unpublished Memeograph, Western Behavioral Science Institute, LaJolla, California, 1966.

Rosenthal, B. G. "The Nature and Development of the Encounter Group Movement." In L. Blank; G. B. Gottsegen; and M. G. Gottsegen (eds.). Confrontation Encounters in Self and Interpersonal Awareness. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971, 435-467.

Ruitenbeek, H. M. The New Group Therapies. USA: Avon Publications, 1970.

Samuels, A. S. The Use of Interracial Group Experience for the Reduction of Racial Tension. New Orleans: Tulane University of Louisiana, 1968.

Saretsky, T. "Resistance in a Group as a Function of the Therapist's Counterferences Expectations." Psychotherapy Theory, Research and Practice 9, No. 3 (Fall 1972) :265-266.

Schein, E. H. and Bennis, W. G. (eds.). Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods. A Laboratory Approach. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Schloss, G.; Siroka, R. W.; and Siroka, E. K. Sensitivity Training and Group Encounter. An Introduction. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1971.

Schofield, W. Psychotherapy. The Purchase of Friendship. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Schutz, W. C. Elements of Encounter. Big Sur, California: Joy Press, 1973.

_____. FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.

Seldman, M. L.; McBrearty, J. F.; and Seldman, S. L. Small Group Behavior 5, No. 1 (February 1974) :80-91.

Semrad, E. U. and Arsenian, J. "The Use of Group Processes in Teaching Group Dynamics." American Journal of Psychotherapy 108 (1951) :358-363.

Slater, P. E. Microcosm: Structural, Psychological, and Religious Evolution in Groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Slavson, S. R. "Sources of Countertransference and Group-Induced Anxiety." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 3, No. 4 (October 1953) :373-388.

Stein, A. "The Training of the Group Psychotherapist." In M. Rosenbaum and M. Berger (eds.). Group Psychotherapy and Group Function. New York: Basic Books, 1963, 558-576.

Stock, D. and Thelen, H. A. Emotional Dynamics and Group Culture. New York: New York University Press, 1958.

Stoller, F. H. "A Stage for Trust." In A. Burton (ed.) Encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, 81-96.

Stroh, G. "A Therapist's Reaction as Reflected in His Reporting on a Psychotherapeutic Group." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 8 (1958) :403-409.

Tannenbaum, R.; Weschler, I. R.; and Massarik, F. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Thomas, H. F. "Encounter--The Game of No Game." In A. Burton (ed.). Encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, 69-80.

Treadwell, T. and Treadwell, I. J. "The Pioneer of the Group Encounter Movement." Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama 25, Nos. 1-2 (1972) :16-25.

Tuckman, B. W. "Developmental Sequence in Small Groups." Psychiatric Bulletin 63, No. 6 (1965) :384-399.

Twelker, P. A. "Classroom Simulation and Teacher Preparation." The School Review 75, No. 2 (Summer, 1967) :197-204.

_____. "Designing Simulation Systems." Education Technology 9, No. 10 (October, 1969) :64-70.

Warkentin, J. "Intensity in Group Encounter." In A. Burton (ed.). Encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, 162-170.

Whitaker, D. S. and Lieberman, M. A. Psychotherapy Through the Group Process. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

White, R. and Lippitt, R. "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three 'Social Climates.'" In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.). Group Dynamics Research and Theory. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1953, 318-335.

Whitman, R. M. "Psychodynamic Principles Underlying T-Group Processes." In L. P. Bradford; J. R. Gibb; and K. D. Benne. T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964, 310-335.

Wile, D. B. "What Do Trainees Learn From a Group Therapy Workshop?" International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 23, No. 2 (April 1973) :185-203.

Yalom, I. D. The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

Yalom, I. D. and Lieberman, M. A. "A Study of Encounter Group Casualities." Archives of General Psychiatry 25 (1971) :16-30.

VITA

Charlette Marple Samuels was born in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania on October 9, 1940. She attended public school in Canonsburg and Mt. Lebanon, Pennsylvania.

In 1962, she was granted a B.A. degree and in 1967, a M. Ed. from the University of Pittsburgh.

She taught high school English and speech at Shaler High School in Glenshaw, Pennsylvania from 1963 to 1966. Between 1968 and 1972, she taught composition and children's literature at the University of Pittsburgh.

She served as a teaching assistant for two years in the counselor education department at the University of Pittsburgh.

At that time she worked both with masters and doctoral level students teaching courses, supervising and counseling students, and leading groups.

Her professional experience ranges from doing individual therapy with psychotic patients to conducting classroom management groups for Model Cities teachers.

END